THE

UNITED STATES

CATHOLIC MAGAZINE

AND MONTHLY REVIEW.

JULY, 1846.

THE HOLY LAND.

Observations in the East; chiefly in Egypt, Palestine, Syria, and Asia Minor. By John P. Durbin, D.D., late president of Dickinson college, author of "Observations in Europe," &c. In two volumes, 12mo. New York: Harper & Brothers, 1845.

HE holy land! The holy land! What Christian heart is there that does not beat quicker and warmer at the very name of the holy land! Who is so cold and indifferent as to be unmoved by the thrilling associations which that name calls up! Who is there that has not more than once fondly wished to visit the places hallowed by the presence and pressed by the footsteps of the great God-man, when *he* vouchsafed, through unbounded love of our race, to walk among men! Who that loves Christianity and its Author has not, over and over again, traversed in fancy the whole land of Palestine, from the Jordan to the sea shore, from Galilee to Jerusalem, pausing, with awful reverence and melting love, at every familiar locality once honored by *his* presence, and meditating, with a heart glowing with a pious enthusiasm, over all those sacred scenes which tell of his splendid miracles and boundless goodness! There is not a hill, nor a valley, nor a desert, nor a brook, nor a town, nor a hamlet, nor even a stone, in all central and northern Palestine, which does not awaken some cherished reminiscence, and stir up the deepest fountains of Christian feeling: they all speak to the Christian *heart* with an eloquence none the less moving because it is silent and mournful.

Such have ever been the feelings awakened in the Christian bosom by a visit to the holy land, whether in reality or in fancy. During the eighteen centuries which have elapsed since the establishment of Christianity, hundreds of thousands of pilgrims have bent their steps towards that sacred soil once watered by

the blood of a God, and have fallen down in humble thankfulness and adoration at *his* tomb. From the most remote quarters of the earth,—from Eastern Asia and Western Europe, from barren Africa and the islands of the sea, from America and the very antipodes,—the ever swelling tide of pilgrimage has rolled on, age by age, to the holy sepulchre; nor is there any reason to believe that it will cease to roll on, so long as there will be true Christians in the world, or so long as the world itself shall endure. The prophecy of Isaiah hath been gloriously fulfilled: "In that day the Root of Jesse, who standeth for an ensign of people, him the gentiles shall beseech, and HIS SEPULCHRE SHALL BE GLORIOUS!"* The nations of the earth have erected his sepulchral monument, and have laid in it and around it the tribute of their hearts' purest affection.

The early Christians set the example of this reverence for Jerusalem and the holy places; they erected chapels over the spots where our Saviour was born at Bethlehem, where he lived with his holy mother and St. Joseph at Nazareth, where he died and was buried on Mount Calvary, and where he ascended to heaven from the summit of Mount Olivet. They also carefully marked the various localities at which the principal events of his passion had occurred, and erected thereon fourteen little oratories or stations, called "the stations of the cross." These clearly indicated the various directions in which he walked, or was dragged by his enemies, in the *via dolorosa*, or sorrowful way, from the garden of Gethsemane and the house of Annas to the summit of Mount Calvary. These localities were too clearly impressed on the minds and hearts of Christians ever to be lost sight of or forgotten. Time and revolution might obliterate the traces of all else; they could not blot out what was so near and dear to the hearts of ransomed millions.

Emulating the zeal, and treading in the footsteps of the earliest disciples of Christ, the Christians of Europe, in the eighth and following centuries, were fired with an ardent desire to visit the holy places, and to testify their love for the Saviour whose religion they had but recently embraced, amid the very scenes of his teachings, sufferings, death, resurrection, and glorious ascension. This feeling was as natural as it was generous. Its general prevalence showed how fervent was the faith, and how glowing the enthusiasm of the Northmen when they had once embraced Christianity. They were willing to leave friends and home, to expose themselves to innumerable perils by sea and by land, and, if need was, to shed their blood in order to enjoy the privilege of visiting the holy sepulchre. With St. Thomas, testifying his willingness to go with his divine Master to Jerusalem, they said: "Let us also go that we may die with him."* The holy city was then in possession of the Saracens, and the Christian pilgrims were exposed to innumerable dangers on the way, and to insult after they had reached their journey's end. These difficulties greatly increased when Jerusalem fell into the hands of the Turks in the eleventh century. Then it was that the pilgrims were exposed to indignities only surpassed by those which their divine Lord had himself endured for their sake on the same spot. They were robbed, buffeted, beaten, and, in many cases, murdered. Yet they ceased not to pour into Palestine from all parts of Europe.

Every one knows the origin of the crusades. The voice of Peter the hermit, graphically portraying the sufferings inflicted on his brother pilgrims in the holy land, rang throughout Europe, and met with a response in the bosoms of pontiffs, and bishops, and emperors, kings, and barons, of the entire mass of the population. The whole west was in a flame. The cry went forth: "The holy city must be rescued from the hands of infidels; our brethren must be protected; pilgrimages to the holy sepulchre must be free; GOD

*Isaiah xi, 10.

*St. John xi, 16.

WILLS IT! GOD WILLS IT!" The choicest spirits of Europe took the cross, and buckled on their good armor; six hundred thousand of the bravest knights that ever unsheathed a sword entered at once on the campaign; and, after prodigies of suffering and valor, Godfrey de Bouillon and his brave comrades planted the banner of the cross on the battlements of Jerusalem in 1099. The holy city was rescued, and every Christian was again free to worship at the tomb of the Saviour. To secure this inestimable advantage, thousands had willingly shed their blood; and now that it was secured, the tide of pilgrimage knew scarcely any bounds. It would seem as if the enthusiastic devotion of western Christendom could be gratified by nothing short of an actual sight of the places where the Saviour had lived and died; and that all Christians were preparing to meet, and to weep together, around the holy sepulchre.

That there was some exaggeration in the length to which this feeling was often carried, can not be denied; that it sprang from a deep and ardent, and generous and unconquerable faith, is equally unquestionable. Had not those ages been conspicuous for a faith marked by all these qualities, the crusades had been utterly impossible. In this cold and calculating age men are in the habit of sneering at those expeditions only, or at least chiefly, because they have not one particle of the faith, nor one spark of the noble enthusiasm in which they originated. Men of this "enlightened" day can not understand how it is that Christians can be so foolish as to waste time, and spend money, and neglect their business for the trifling gratification of visiting the holy land. With the traitorous apostle of old, they are almost prepared to ask: "Why this waste?"

Whence this comparative coldness in regard to the holy land? Whence the general want of those feelings of reverence for the holy place, for which our pious forefathers were so much distinguished? Has the world really become more enlightened; or has it only become more selfish? Is it owing to the fact that, for three centuries, the "pure light" of the reformation has been beaming upon the world? or is it ascribable to the greater prevalence of mammonism? We fear it is owing to both these causes combined; or rather to the former superinducing the latter. The tendency of the reformation, as clearly and unequivocally developed in the spirit of the present age, has been to shed additional light upon mere human interests, and to shroud in greater darkness those of the spiritual order; to promote man's happiness in time at the expense of his happiness in eternity; to array matter against spirit, and to give the preference to the former. In the whole history of the past, there never was a period of which we can say with more truth, "charity hath grown cold," according to the Saviour's prediction.

Most men have too much important business to attend to now-a-days, to think of visiting the holy sepulchre; and, what is worse, many of those who do go thither, go rather with a view to gratify idle curiosity, to doubt, and to sneer, than to meditate, to pray, to adore, and to weep with Magdalen at the tomb of Christ. The sight of the holy places awakens in the bosoms of these men no feelings of devotion; if they have any sentiments of piety, or even any hearts, they appear to have left them at home, lest they should be lost *en route;* and they furnish another strong evidence confirmatory of the old adage: "those who travel much rarely become pious."

This is particularly true of all the Protestant travellers in Palestine with whose works we are acquainted. The case is, however, we are happy to say, very different with Catholic pilgrims in the same country. What a contrast, for instance, between the glowing Catholic feeling of a Chateaubriand, a Lamartine, and a Geramb, and the cold Protestant spirit of a Dr. Robinson, a Dr. Olin, and a Dr. Dur-

bin! The contrast lies on the very surface; it is so marked that no one can help being struck by it. In reading the works of the three first named writers,* you see at once and you *feel* that they are Christians who love the Saviour, and are deeply interested in every thing at all connected with his history; in reading those of the three last, you also believe that they are Christians, because they tell you so; but you can scarcely realize it to yourself; you certainly can not *feel* it, because they do not seem to feel it themselves. They show about as much emotion, while standing near the tomb of Christ or that of his holy Mother, as they would while looking on that of Pompey or Cleopatra!

We intend to prove, by a few brief specifications from the work of Dr. Durbin, that we are not at all dealing in exaggeration. Before we do so, however, we must remark that we do not attach so much blame to him personally, as to the system in which he has been reared. Dr. Durbin himself seems to be an amiable gentleman, and a respectable writer; and we are disposed to deal the more leniently with him, from the fact that, so far as our own knowledge extends, he is almost the only writer of any distinction that has ever been produced by the Methodist society in the United States. We are nevertheless of the opinion that his reputation as an author has not been greatly enhanced by his "Observations in the East." With the exception of a few chapters of general remarks on the condition and prospects of the east, and his minute description of his visit to the seven Apocalyptic churches of Asia, we found little in his two volumes that was either new or interesting; or that had not been already said, and perhaps *better said*, by previous tourists.

What shocked our feelings most in the perusal of Dr. Durbin's account of the holy land, was his frequent exhibition of a carping and skeptical spirit, and his habitual coldness and indifference while visiting spots which have ever been held sacred by Christian pilgrims. We would naturally look for such a spirit in an infidel visiting Palestine in order to sneer at Christianity; we were certainly not prepared to find it in a Christian minister, especially in one who belongs to a sect as remarkable for its wild enthusiasm of feeling as for its depreciation of learning. Some men seem to think that true strength of mind is measured by the amount of incredulity, rather than by that of faith; and by the absence, rather than by the presence of feeling. A man is great and learned, according to them, not in proportion to what he believes, but in proportion to what he has the hardihood to reject. Dr. Durbin seems to have practically adopted this principle in his estimate of the topography of the holy land. He believes as little as possible, and feels still less than he believes.

He looks upon tradition as a very unsafe criterion for determining the site of those spots hallowed by the great mysteries of Christianity. He habitually sneers at the absurdity of "monkish traditions," and blesses his own superior education and enlightenment that he is not under the necessity of believing one tithe of the monkish legends in regard to the holy land. He even often prefers a loose conjecture of his own to a *fact* settled by the unanimous belief of past ages. Our limits will not allow us to go into many details in illustration of these general remarks; a few will suffice to establish their accuracy and justice.

Our reverend tourist thus describes his visit to the birth place of the Saviour in Bethlehem:

"We were next conducted into the sacred crypt where the Saviour *is said* to have been born. The floor, sides, and ceiling are enclosed in finely polished marbles. The precise spot of the Saviour's birth is marked by a brilliant star let into the floor, and encircled with a silver band on which is inscribed, *Hic de Virgine Maria Jesus Christus natus est.* As we

* All of which have been translated and republished in this country. That of La Martine is the least to our taste.

approached the star, the once iron frame of our aged pilgrim companion shook convulsively, and he dropped on his knees and crossed himself. His Italian servant knelt behind him, but our Greek hurried forward, prostrated himself hastily three times, pressing his head to the pavement near the star, and then crossed himself. The monks knelt with candles in their hands, and silence reigned for a few minutes. We STOOD *in the back ground and looked on* (!!). The impression of that scene will never pass from me. There knelt a monk from Austria, another from Savoy, a Greek from Thessaly, an Italian from Naples, a Frenchman from Lyons, while four strangers from the new world STOOD BY, all intently looking on that lone star, the star of Bethlehem."*

The reader of this remarkable extract can not fail to notice the strange contrast in the amount of feeling manifested by those representatives of different nations, and the four more enlightened strangers from the new world who *stood*, like the Pharisees of old, *looking on*, and probably thanking God that they were not so ignorant and superstitious as their brother pilgrims. These four men were the only *strangers* there; they seem to have *felt* that they were intruding on ground not their own; the other pilgrims felt themselves completely at home, and acted accordingly. How naturally their actions were suited to their belief may be inferred from the fact that Dr. Durbin had to harden his own heart, and do himself violence in order not to be carried away by their example!

"Standing as we were," he says, "over the grotto of the nativity, it was *with difficulty that we restrained ourselves* from following the example of our Greek servant, Georgio, who fell on his knees, and cried out in good earnest, *Kyrie Eleison, Kyrie Eleison*, a gush of tears attesting his sincerity."†

Where would have been the harm in so doing? Is it any sin to kneel and weep, even on the site of the Lord's nativity?

But Dr. Durbin did not believe that this was in reality the spot on which the Saviour was born: it was all a mere monkish legend, contrary to the narrative of Scripture? And why so? Because *he* is pleased to infer from St. Luke's account, that Jesus was born, not in a grotto, but in the first or basement story of the inn used as a stable, the upper story, or inn proper, being already full. Even granting this, how does he know that the basement story was not partly under ground; or that the inn was not built over one of those natural grottoes so common in Palestine, and which are, even to this day, so often there used as stables? He says that "the geological conformation of the ridge at this point is against the supposition of a cave here."* This is vague enough. Is there not a cave there now? And why should there not have been one eighteen hundred years ago? Is the mere geological "supposition" of a Methodist preacher to outweigh the unanimous belief of all ages? How does he know but by tradition that modern Bethlehem occupies the precise site of the ancient town? How, in fact, except by this kind of evidence, does he know any thing concerning the topography of the holy land? Where, then, is the consistency in rejecting tradition in particular cases, and without any valid reason? He tells us: "To identify the precise spot of the nativity is impossible. Perhaps the inn stood on the ground now occupied by the convent,"† &c. Very satisfactory, truly! So he rejects the popular belief on the subject, without even proposing a substitute for it! This is modern Protestant criticism; powerful at destruction, and powerless in building up.

And yet this is a pretty fair specimen of the doctor's reasoning in regard to the topography of the holy land. In the same self-sufficient and summary way, he disposes of the popular belief in regard to the site of the Virgin's tomb in the valley of Gethsemane, that of the Lord's ascension, that of the various stations in the *via dolorosa*, and that of the holy sepulchre

* Vol. i, pp. 218, 219. † Ibid. p. 218.

* Ibid. p. 220. † Ibid.

itself! His own crude fancies take the place of a venerable and long cherished tradition; and, what is yet more remarkable, he, as we have just intimated, destroys every thing with a mere sweep of the pen, without building up any thing on the ruins! Admit the justice of his truthless criticism, and there will not remain one hallowed spot in the whole of Palestine: all will be annihilated, and the interest so long felt in that sacred soil by every Christian heart must cease for ever. What a marvel! One Methodist preacher, treading in the footsteps of his illustrious American predecessor, Dr. Robinson, has succeeded in completely revolutionizing the topography of the holy land! The belief of ages is upturned, and a new era hath dawned upon a more "enlightened" age!

Mark with what cold heartlessness he treated, or rather neglected, the tomb of the holy Virgin Mother of God, which so many enlightened pilgrims before him had visited with feelings of most lively enthusiasm and veneration!

"In the deep bottom of the valley nearly opposite to this gate (St. Stephen's), we found the *reputed* tomb of the Virgin. It is a large cave or grotto excavated from the rock. A church of some pretension is erected over it, into which you descend from the south and east by broad flights of marble steps. As we had no faith in the legends of the place, and *had not much time to spare, we did not enter the grotto.* A rough, boorish pilgrim, with his wife and children, coarse and swarthy, were standing at some distance off in the road, reverently gazing on the tomb, and crossing themselves with much apparent devotion."*

This passage again forcibly reminds us of the parable of the Pharisee and the publican. We incline to the opinion that that "boorish pilgrim" who stood reverently gazing from a distance at the tomb of her who bore his Lord and Master, as though he was unworthy to enter it, had much more, not only "apparent," but real devotion, than our scoffing doctor of divinity, who could not spare time to visit a spot, the identity of which he denies without a particle of evidence! And yet he had time and inclination enough to visit many other tombs of little comparative interest, in the immediate vicinity of the holy city! And yet he could find time to indulge in "heartfelt sadness while casting his eyes over the chosen resting place of God's forsaken people!"* This is not the only instance in which his sympathies are evidently more Jewish than Christian; as we shall have occasion to see in the sequel.

Here is another striking specimen of a kindred spirit. The author is describing his visit to Mount Olivet, the site fixed by tradition for the Lord's ascension.

"The first edifice erected here is ascribed to the Empress Helena, but it has long since fallen into decay; there is still a small chapel, built mainly of the fragments of the ancient structure. Within this chapel is shown an impression made in the living stone by the foot of our Saviour as he ascended to heaven! A very unclerical looking monk showed us the relic, and seemed surprised that we evinced no signs of devotion, although he had kept a group of coarse looking people waiting until the *hiwadjeh*, or gentlemen (!), had satisfied themselves; but, as the legend which he repeated was, to our *certain knowledge* (!), a pure fiction, we could not honestly appear to believe it. This summit was fixed upon as the place of the ascension as early as the fourth century, probably by the monks, who swarmed in Palestine at the time. Probably they were misled by Acts i, 12: 'Then returned they into Jerusalem from the mount called Olivet,' &c."†

Dr. Durbin will surely pardon us for putting more reliance in the unanimous statement of "the monks who swarmed through Palestine in the fourth century," than in his own bare assertion, based upon what he considers the most "natural" route the apostles would have taken on their return to Jerusalem, after having witnessed the ascension. When the Empress St. Helena visited the holy land,

* Vol. i, p. 237.

* Ibid. p. 239. See also p. 278, for his feeling account of the Jewish *Place of Wailing.*

† Ibid. p. 250.

early in the fourth century, the universal belief of the Christians in the vicinity of Jerusalem pointed to the summit of Mount Olivet as the real site of the ascension; and, in accordance with this belief, she had a splendid church erected on the spot. Up to that time there had been an almost uninterrupted succession of Christians in Palestine, and even in the holy city; and the events of our Lord's life were still as fresh as though they had happened but yesterday. The acknowledged fact that, in the beginning of the fourth century, Mount Olivet was unanimously regarded as the precise spot from which Christ ascended to heaven, presents a conclusive argument that this belief had been handed down from the very beginning of Christianity. It would have been as impossible to change the location as it would be for us now to substitute some other locality in New England for the real Plymouth Rock. The event commemorated by the site was too important, and the reminiscences connected with it were too deeply cherished by Christian hearts, to allow of any such substitution. The thing was impossible. As to the foot-print of the Blessed Saviour in the living rock, it is not more extraordinary than a hundred other miracles wrought by our Lord, and recorded in that sacred volume which Dr. Durbin professes to venerate so much.

The skepticism and coldness of our reverend Christian minister, shocked not only his brother Christians, but also greatly scandalized the Turks themselves! He acknowledges this in the following curious passage:

"At a little distance south stands a Turkish mosque, said to cover the tomb of David. We were denied admission, as Christian dogs, into the lower part of the building, which tradition deems to be the sacred grave, but were shown into the second story, which is no less famous in Christian history. A long low apartment is exhibited as the *cœnaculum*, or 'upper room,' in which our Lord ate the Passover with his disciples. In the east end of the room is a small Christian altar, and in the south an oratory for Mussulmen, as both religions venerate the spot. *The Turks seemed surprised at our want of reverence*, as we neither worshipped at the altar, nor bowed at the oratory; we did not disclose to them our entire skepticism as to the localities which they held in such high honor. Titus not only left no building standing in Jerusalem, but ploughed up the very soil of Mount Zion."*

Well, suppose he did; could not another similar building have been erected on the same spot? The tradition, if we understand it aright, regards the identity of the site, rather than that of the building itself. We are not at all surprised at the astonishment of the Turks; all that surprises us is that they should have set Dr. Durbin down as a "Christian dog!" They had probably seldom seen such a specimen of Christianity before! To them he must have appeared a nondescript, something neither exactly Christian, nor exactly Turkish.

The astonishment of the Mussulmans must have greatly increased when they witnessed the scandalous behaviour of our reverend traveller on his visit to the holy sepulchre. He was much too enlightened to join the vulgar "mob of devotees who crowded to the entrance, pushing and jostling each other, as if their very salvation depended upon speedy admittance."† Speaking of the "stone of unction, on which, according to the monkish tradition, our Lord's body was washed, anointed, and laid out for burial," he uses this profane language:

"The pilgrims pressed to the spot, and eagerly kissed the slab, as if it had life and affection to impart to them. Distinctions of rank were forgotten; a European officer, in rich uniform, covered with decorations, knelt beside an Armenian boor, and pressed his lips upon the very spot which, a moment before, had been touched by the mouth, redolent with garlic, of a Copt from Egypt, or a Nubian from the Upper Nile. What will not man do to save his soul, except 'believe on the Lord Jesus Christ with a heart unto righteousness.'"‡

*Ibid. p. 272. †Ib. p. 299. ‡Ib. p. 299-300.

We fancy that those devoted pilgrims believed in the Lord Jesus Christ much more strongly than did our self-righteous and sneering and unfeeling preacher, who stood off, like a Pharisee, scoffing at their simplicity, and admiring his own superior mental acumen! We opine that if they had not had this unwavering belief, they would not have manifested so much devotion in the holy sepulchre, but would rather have stayed quietly at home, where Dr. Durbin himself should have remained until he had acquired faith enough to be able to profit by a visit to the holy land. Had he taken this precaution, and undergone this preliminary spiritual discipline, he might, perhaps, have overcome his repugnance to kiss a spot which had been just touched by a mouth "redolent with garlic." Oh, horrible! that an enlightened Christian minister should be expected to offer such violence to his dainty senses! that he should be called on to make such a sacrifice, even at the tomb of that Saviour who died for his salvation!

His description of the remaining portions of the holy sepulchre is in the same irreverent and unchristian vein. Thus, speaking of the place where our Saviour's body was laid in the tomb by Nicodemus, he says:

"When I entered the chamber, three or four pilgrims were prostrate upon the edge of the sarcophagus, rapt in an intense devotion, such as I have never seen elsewhere. It seemed as though they would breathe out their lives in the deep-drawn sighs which they uttered; and they pressed their burning and convulsed lips upon the tomb, as if they would draw the very power of redemption from the insensible marble. I could not but be interested in such a scene as this, *mournful and degrading as it was;* nor, indeed, could I restrain an INVOLUNTARY SHUDDER, as I pressed my hand upon the cold stone, and, for a moment, thought that *possibly* the Saviour of the world might have lain there."*

This heartless description grates so very harshly on our own notions of propriety, and of what a *Christian* should naturally feel while visiting the tomb of his dear Saviour, that we can scarcely "restrain an involuntary shudder" while transcribing it. A Christian minister shuddering, and involuntarily too, at the holy sepulchre! Well, what next? The fervent Christian pilgrim bows down, presses his lips to the sacred stone, and is rapt in intense devotion; this minister of an obscure sect, which sprang up but yesterday, sneers at his ardent piety, and strives, meanwhile, to suppress an "involuntary shudder," which, nevertheless, shakes his frame, as a substitute for a tender feeling of love and devotion, of which he is wholly unsusceptible! Would the doctor have *shuddered* had he been present at the entombment of our blessed Lord? Alas for the coldness and heartlessness of Protestantism! for, we repeat it, we blame the *system* much more than we do its not unfaithful representative. A Protestant visiting the holy sepulchre must do violence to his better feelings if he would not be a Catholic. Dr. Durbin's example and avowal have sufficiently proved this.

But, perhaps, the most objectionable passage in the whole book is that in which the author sums up his impressions of the Christian worship in the church of the Holy Sepulchre. Here again he evidently sides with the disciples of Mohammed against his own brethren, the disciples of Jesus Christ; and he does it openly and without any disguise whatever. He indirectly attacks Christianity itself, in order to stab Catholicity; and there even seems to have existed a secret understanding and mutual sympathy on the subject between himself and the ruffian Turkish soldiery who guarded the holy sepulchre. Here is the passage:

"Thus wretchedly is Christianity represented in Jerusalem by two of its most powerful sects (the Catholics and the Greeks). Even the very soldiers that guard the sepulchre, and make gain from the fees of the pilgrims that visit it, do not refrain from expressing their disdain and disgust for Christianity; and I shall not soon forget the marked, and even triumphant smile of superiority which two

* Ibid. p. 301.

of these men cast upon me just as I was leaving the church, at the moment when the cry of the muezzin from an adjacent minaret broke upon their ears: '*God is great; there is but one God.*' The expressive play of their countenances asked me, almost as plainly as words could have done, 'Can these degrading superstitions be acceptable to Allah, who is a Spirit? Can these quarrelsome Christians be his true worshippers?' I visited the church three several times, and each time I came away sad and dejected, under the painful conviction that its very existence, so long as it is a centre of superstition and an object of strife, is a curse to Christianity. Had I been born a Jew or a Moslem in Jerusalem, nothing short of the miraculous power of God could have converted me to Christianity, so utterly worthless and degrading are its daily exhibitions on the very spot where it is claimed to have been consummated by the death and resurrection of its author."*

We would be really curious to know what the Turkish soldiery would have thought, had they witnessed, in the church of the Holy Sepulchre, the strange worship of the Methodist sect, in all its wild enthusiasm and peculiar medley of sights and sounds! Or what they would have thought, if they had been made to witness there the remarkable exhibition of more than a hundred rival Christian sects, all contradicting one another, and yet all claiming to be the true church, and all struggling for the right to worship at the tomb of Christ? They would have been much more startled, we ween, at this curious spectacle, than at the occasional disputes which occur between the Catholic and the Greek pilgrims.

Dr. Durbin plainly intimates that the worship of the Mussulmans † is much more spiritual, and therefore much more worthy of Allah, and more akin to that of Protestantism, than is the worship of either the Greeks or the Catholics. Even were it so, it would be rather an equivocal compliment to Protestantism. But even the supposition that such is the case betrays either great ignorance in Dr. Durbin, or a wish to mislead the uninformed. The pilgrim at Mecca goes through at least as many ceremonies, evinces at least as much feeling, and is guilty of at least as much of what the doctor would call degrading superstition, as the pilgrim at Jerusalem; and our tourist is surely well acquainted with this fact. Why then degrade the Christian, in order to elevate the Mohammedan pilgrim? If all Christians shared in the sentiments of our Methodist doctor, the church of the Holy Sepulchre would never have been built, or it would, in all probability, be now speedily destroyed; and then there would be no one left to weep at the tomb of Christ.

We think our readers will, by this time, agree with us in the opinion that Dr. Durbin would have done much better to stay at home until he had acquired sufficient faith and piety to profit by a pilgrimage to the holy land.

But he did not believe that the church of the Holy Sepulchre was erected on the identical spot upon which Christ was crucified and buried. Though he admits that "a large class, not merely of ignorant pilgrims, but of learned writers, both Catholic and Protestant, have maintained, and do still maintain, that the present church of the sepulchre really covers the very spots where our Lord was crucified and buried;" yet he, as usual, sides with Dr. Robinson, who had found out, by an accurate measurement of the topography, and by deeper researches into Christian antiquity, that it was all a mistake; and that consequently the whole Christian world had been grossly deluded on the subject for eighteen centuries!

But upon what arguments does this new discovery rest? Chiefly upon two: 1. The insufficiency of the tradition alleged in support of the identity, and which dates back, we are told, only to the beginning of the fourth century: 2. The circumstance that the church stands *within* the walls of the holy city, whereas Mount Calvary lay without.

* Vol. i, p. 304.

† Not Mussulmen, as he sometimes writes it.

Every one will see at a glance how very insufficient, and even puerile, are these reasons. Does not the admitted fact that such was the universal belief of Christians in the beginning of the fourth century, argue strongly in favor of the existence of a previous tradition on the subject? Is it to be supposed, without proof, that the Christians of the first three centuries entirely lost sight of the spot on which their Lord had been crucified, especially as that spot was a mount, the traces of which could not possibly have been so soon obliterated?

But Eusebius says that the place of the sepulchre was discovered by a miracle; and Dr. Durbin laughs at this miracle. Unless we are greatly mistaken, the miracle alluded to regarded the identity of the true cross on which Christ died, rather than that of the site on which it was found; and, therefore, it has nothing whatever to do with the present controversy.

The fact that the holy sepulchre lies *within* the present walls of the city is equally inconclusive; because this does not prove that such was the case eighteen hundred years ago. Dr. Durbin argues that the ancient walls must have enclosed the present site, else the city never could have contained so vast a population as to justify the statement of Josephus, "that 1,100,000 *men* perished in the siege, and 90,000 were sold into captivity!"* Nonsense. Does Josephus say that all those men were actual *citizens* of Jerusalem? Is it not, on the contrary, probable, or even certain, that they were from almost all parts of Judea, and that they merely sought a refuge in the holy city? So that all the learned arguments of Doctors Durbin and Robinson against the identity of the site, prove exactly nothing. If the holy sepulchre be not on the location of the ancient Calvary, where, we ask, is that locality to be found? Will these learned antiquaries have the goodness to informs us? They do not even attempt to do so. The reason is obvious, they could not. And we are even foolish enough to think that the present site of the holy sepulchre will continue to be visited with veneration by thousands of pious pilgrims long after the works of our learned doctors will have descended with themselves to the tomb.

* Ibid. p. 309

Dr. Durbin did not manifestly visit the holy city for the purposes of piety; much less did he go thither as an humble Christian pilgrim "to chastise his body and bring it under subjection" after the example of St. Paul.* He was much too enlightened to practise such degrading mummery as this. He very appropriately left this for the ignorant rabble of Catholic and Greek pilgrims. He reached Jerusalem during the penitential season of Lent; but he took special care not to be trammeled by any of its painful observances.

"The convent," he tells us, "supplied us with bread, salt fish, and vegetables; but as it was Lent, we had to buy our own meat. With these substantials, to which we added tea, coffee, sugar, figs, and dates of our own, our cook managed to set out an excellent table during our stay at the convent. We advise all visiters† to Jerusalem to live in the same way."‡

The good monks were probably as much scandalized at him as had been the pious Mussulmans. Seldom had they seen so unmortified a pilgrim, or one so thoroughly sensual, dainty, and undevout.

The first thing he did on entering the holy city was to call on Mrs. Whiting, the wife of the American Protestant missionary, who was then absent. He

"Spent a most agreeable hour with Mrs. Whiting. Every thing was pleasant; it was pleasant to see an accomplished American lady in this distant land, and especially to see her engaged in so holy and noble a work; it was pleasant to talk of our far-off home; and even the sight of the *rocking chairs and the workstand, which were obviously of Yankee manufacture*, was pleasant to our eyes."§

Very pleasant, truly! Only think of it: an American missionary and his "ac-

* 1 Corinth. ix, 27.
† He means, of course, all *Protestant* visiters.
‡ Vol. i, p. 251. § Ibid. p. 253.

complished lady" travelling all the way to Jerusalem, duly supplied with "rocking chairs and a workstand of Yankee manufacture," to aid them "in the holy and noble work" of converting the infidels thereabouts! The idea is capital. Had rocking chairs been invented at the time of the apostles, they would probably have been used as powerful aids in the glorious work of evangelizing the nations! Men would then have been taught to "rock themselves" into heaven in the most approved modern style!

The next thing our reverend tourist did at Jerusalem was to cleanse and refresh his outward man by taking a luxurious Turkish bath. He gives us a minute description of the whole operation in all its interesting details; how he was successively rubbed, and scrubbed, and drenched, and perfumed, to his heart's content; how he "rejected the proffered pipe, but drank a cup of delicious coffee, and fell asleep;" and how "he awoke wonderfully refreshed, and returned home."† Very interesting, and very edifying!

He had, about the same time, a long conversation with an old Jewish banker, who pronounced the resurrection of Christ and all Christianity "a humbug," and gave his reasons for remaining a Jew. The doctor seems to have been greatly interested in the arguments of this hoary blasphemer; and if he answered them at all, he takes care to suppress his responses. As the case stands in his book, the Jew had evidently the better of the argument. This is again very edifying.

We have room at present for but one more curious extract from the doctor's book: he is speaking of the grotto of Jeremiah the prophet.

"We found nothing of interest, except the obvious fragments of an extensive and superior structure once existing here. The legend is that Jeremiah once resided in this grotto, and his couch is shown—a ledge cut out of the rock, six or eight feet from the ground. The grotto is much venerated *by Jews, Moslems, and Romanists.*"*

This is a singular method of grouping: "Romanists"—a vulgar nickname of which a man so enlightened as Dr. Durbin should have been heartily ashamed—are not only put along with Jews and Moslems, but occupy the last place! We think he would almost prefer Judaism or Mohammedanism to "Romanism." He should have added that this, and all the other holy places of Palestine, are treated with disregard and open contempt, with scoffs and sneers, by that class of *Christians* whom he faithfully represents, and for whose vitiated taste he caters. We would ask every impartial man to decide, laying his hand upon his heart, which are the true disciples of Christ;—those who contemn the places hallowed by his holy life and death, or those who cherish and honor them out of love for him? The answer is obvious.

We have made these animadversions, not through any unkind feelings towards Dr. Durbin, whom we respect as a man of some ability and cleverness, but with a view to place in a strong light the feelings and sentiments of that class of Christians whom he represents. If we have spoken plainly, and even sometimes severely, it is because we felt a just indignation at the sneering skepticism and utter heartlessness of that class of visiters to the holy land of which the doctor is a not unfaithful specimen. We think it is far better to have too much faith and too much piety, especially in a city so holy as Jerusalem, than to have none at all. Some people, like Dr. Durbin, discard piety under the pretext of superstition. Such people would be obviously more at home at a camp-meeting than at the holy sepulchre.

* Ibid. pp. 258-9.

* Ibid. p. 242.

THOSE VESPER BELLS.

BY S. CAMERON.

'T is summer's pensive twilight reign;
The world seems one imbodied thought;
Silence and shadows fill the plain,
And nature to the flowers has brought
Refreshing balm of crystal dews;
And zephyr leaves its place of spells,
And, with a voice of music, wooes
The modest flowers that love the dells.

The spirit of the hour awakes
To luxury of thought and truth,
Pure as the waters of those lakes
Where spirits drink immortal youth;
And, through the silent Sabbath air,
A heavenly music soars and swells—
Making a glorious Eden here—
The music of the vesper bells.

I heard those bells, at morning hour,
Summoning worshippers to pray,
And felt their holiness of power,
As though from heavenly harp a lay
Of promised mercy had awoke,
Such as on that redeeming morn
Gladly upon Judea broke,
Proclaiming the Redeemer born.

And then, as grew the golden light
Of day to fulness and to gladness,
I shared the bliss of sound and sight,
And felt not e'en one pulse of sadness.
But change of time brought change of soul;
And now I love these lonely dells,
Where, with a sadd'ning cadence, roll
The echoes of those vesper bells.

For evening says life's brightest day
Must also have its closing hour;
That manhood's pride will pass away
From earth, and perish as the flower;
And I must to the grave descend,
The grave where silent darkness dwells,
To meet no more my cherished friend,
And hear no more those vesper bells.

Oh God! how full of bitter tears
Of agony, the very thought
That they, the friends of fondest years,
Whose sympathies the heart has sought
As its best refuge—solace—home—
Where love, enshrined 'mid virtues, dwells,
Must part, and I within the tomb,
Nor hear with them those vesper bells.

When earth is past, and I am gone
On that far journey, which the mind
Of man may oft reflect upon,
But which has never been defined;
When on that journey I depart,
Friendship even now my spirit tells
A thought of me will reach thy heart
Whene'er thou hear'st those vesper bells.

Thou spirit, of the earth revered,
Among a thousand here to me,
Oh! let a memory shrine be reared
Where my rapt soul can list to thee,
And let thy pious thoughts arise
For him within the grave who dwells;
'T will meet and mingle in the skies
With music from the vesper bells.

Dews will not be the only tears
Upon the grass above my head,
For some will mingle with thy prayers
To tell of sorrow for the dead;
And as some angel wafts above
Thy prayer to Him who highest dwells,
Thou 'lt hear thy God's rewarding love,
In sweetness of those vesper bells.

Then when the rosy Sabbath morn
In glory treadeth o'er the hills,
Or evening gems the fragrant thorn,
And with her dews the blossom fills,
Whisper thy friend, who, low and lone,
Sleepeth amid the silent dells,
And he will hear thy music tone,
Oft heard beside those vesper bells.

When in their beautiful array,
Through time's bright vista shine the hours,
In which our steps rejoiced to stray
Through avenues of odorous flowers,
O wilt thou not in fancy deem
The whisper of my spirit dwells,
Like echo of some tuneful dream,
And mingles with those vesper bells!

PÉRE JEAN, OR THE JESUIT MISSIONARY.

A CATHOLIC STORY FOUNDED ON FACTS.

(Continued from page 275.)

CHAPTER VIII.

HE forest to the north of the village was filled with undergrowth, and was wild and rocky, rising at times into hills of considerable size, which swept gradually down until they melted in the gentle ascent upon which the Mohawk village stood. Towards the close of the day, which had been signalized by the return of the war party, a solitary Indian cautiously made his way through the thick bushes, replacing every leaf and branch in its position, and covering each footstep as he passed. His course was turned in the direction of the wildest of the hills. As he proceeded, the ground became more broken and rocky until a huge ledge rose abruptly in the forest, jutting almost over the summits of the oaks. At the foot of the cliff he paused for a moment, and surveyed the face and summit of the rock. He seemed satisfied, and moved along the base of the ledge until he reached a part that was less precipitous, and was covered with bushes and creepers growing out of the many crevices and spots of earth upon its sides. Here he paused for a moment, and, having made a low signal, which was answered from above, began to ascend. A little distance from the summit, the rock receded until it opened into something like a cave, which was completely hidden from below by the bushes and wild vines in bloom, which here clustered thick upon the side of the ascent. At the further end of the recess sat two figures, silent and motionless; their rifles* were lying near them. The Indian entered and took his seat by his companions; at length he spoke, pointing with his hand over his shoulder towards the village.

"The Hurons and the blackgown are in the council lodge. No more gauntlet; the warriors from the other villages have gone," he said, and held up the fingers of both hands twice to indicate their number. "So many braves at the village," and he again held up his fingers till they indicated forty; "must wait." The Hurons assented, and Ahasistari continued: "The blackgown is weak and bruised; many days must pass before he can travel again to the river. The Hurons must wait till they can go faster than the Mohawk, or they will gather from the tribes and follow on the trail."

At length one of the Hurons spoke: "Watook may collect the braves, and be here in another sun."

"Quickfoot," said Ahasistari, "it is better that he should lie out with the warriors some distance in the forest. There is a little stream, a day's journey from the village of the Mohawks; we crossed it on the trail. Let him hide upon its banks. If he come nearer, a wandering Mohawk might strike upon his trail, and then all hope will be lost. We can not attempt a rescue until the blackgowns are strong enough to journey with us. Watook and his braves will follow the trail of the Mohawks; Quickfoot must retrace it, and meet him. He will bid him to remain until Ahasistari commands again."

"Good," said the Huron, and, taking up his rifle, wearied as he was, with the

*This term has been used throughout this story; perhaps *musket* would have been more correct, though at the date of the story few Indians were possessed of fire-arms at all. The Mohawks obtained them at an earlier period, having been supplied by the Dutch traders.

elastic tread of the brave, departed. The others sat still.

Ahasistari and his two followers had hovered around the trail of the Mohawks, but as the foe was very numerous—about fifty warriors in all—had not obtained a single opportunity of attempting the rescue of the prisoners by artifice; of course force was out of the question. It now became necessary for the chief to delay his operations for the reasons which he gave his followers, and also in the hope that the number of the warriors at the village might be reduced by some new expedition, and thus afford a favorable opportunity of making an assault, with whatever braves Watook might bring up, to whom he could at any time transmit his orders by his remaining companion. In the meantime, too, some chance of a successful stratagem might present itself, and he determined to watch the village closely to secure if possible the escape of his friends.

When the Mohawks had approached the end of their journey, the Hurons forsook their trail, and struck off through the forest to the hills, among which they were now concealed, having perceived them on their path from the summit of a distant elevation. The track of a fox had led them up the ledge of rocks to the cave, and, at the same time, gave them the assurance that it was altogether unfrequented by their foes. Leaving his companions, Ahasistari then crept stealthily towards the village, and reached it in time to be a witness from a neighboring thicket of all the scenes which followed upon the arrival of the war party, and learned from a single glance the condition of the captives. His plan was formed, and he returned to the rocks to carry them out. With twenty good braves he would not have hesitated to attack the village, knowing the vast advantage which darkness and surprise give to even a few assailants over a larger number, mingled with women and children, and unprepared for battle. The village, too, was not defended by any stockade or fortification, for such was the terror of the Mohawk name that few of their enemies dared to set foot upon their territory. But Ahasistari deemed it more prudent to postpone the attempt, judging from the departure of the braves of the neighboring village without carrying with them a portion of the prisoners, that for the present they were in no danger of public execution. Such, however, he knew to be the passionate cruelty of the Iroquois that any one of them might be sacrificed at a moment. This danger could not be avoided.

The night that followed was a festive one in the village of the Mohawks. Long continued were the rejoicings of the people over the valor of the braves, and it was determined in council to despatch runners to Fort Orange with a portion of the booty, which had been large, to procure "fire-water" from the traders for a solemn festival over the victory. In the midst of all this joy, many sleepless hours had passed over the heads of the two Frenchmen. Sore, bruised, suffering intense pain, unable to lie at ease, slumber long delayed to shroud their weariness in oblivion. At length it came. The Hurons, after the prayers of the night had been said, soon yielded to sleep, accustomed as they were to catch repose in any attitude. Day broke gaily over the village, and the rays of the bright sun stole in through the chinks of the council lodge, and rested in golden streaks upon the hard trodden earthen floor. As the luminary rose higher in the sky, a beam, playing through a narrow crevice, crept slowly over the pale face of the young novice. His lips were drawn apart, a fixed expression of pain dwelt upon his features, and his heavy and disturbed breathing denoted the fever that raged in his veins. He slept on; the joyous ray playing upon his sad features, myriads of motes holding their gay revels in its beams. Near him slumbered Father Laval. The Hurons were stretched around upon the floor in deep sleep. At the door of the lodge sat the guard, his head resting upon his knee,

and his quick eye occasionally scanning the slumberers; but for its motion he would have seemed as rapt in sleep as they. Time passed on; the sounds without told that the village was again all alive, and one by one the Hurons awoke from their long repose, and, stretching their cramped limbs as best they might, arose to a sitting posture. A single glance of his quick eye was all the notice the guard deigned to bestow upon the movements. The two Frenchmen still slept on. At length Father Laval awoke. For a moment he gazed around unable to realize his situation; then turning himself, he endeavored to kneel; the effort was painful, but he succeeded. René Bourdoise now opened his eyes, but he was unable to move.

"Do not seek to rise, my son," said the Jesuit, "you are too weak; the prayer of the heart is acceptable to God, whether you kneel or not." Then Father Laval addressed the Hurons. "My children, from the midst of our sufferings let us cry out to heaven for mercy, not for the bodies which are of earth and perishable, but for the souls which are immortal, undying. Let us beseech our heavenly Father to accept our sufferings here in atonement through the blood of his Son for the sins of our past lives. Let us not repine. We suffer—'it is for the greater glory of God.' He will draw good for us out of this evil. Let us pray; let us join in spirit with our brethren of the mission of St. Mary in the holy sacrifice of the altar."

The Indians listened in silence, and the Jesuit prayed aloud. Many moments passed thus in holy prayer and meditation. Streams of heavenly consolation seemed to pour down upon the priest and his little flock. Rapt in holy abstraction, their sufferings were all forgotten; and, seated in heart at the foot of the Saviour's cross, their own sorrows dwindled into nothingness in the contemplation of his infinite passion. Then the stern spirit of the Hurons melted, and the enduring warrior became the contrite penitent.

"The anger of the Iroquois is unsparing, my father. Death may be ours at any moment," said Leloup, as the consoling prayer was ended.

"True, my son; let us prepare to meet it;" and the Indian, moving nearer to the priest, began his confession. It was done; and the Jesuit pronounced the words of absolution in virtue of that power committed by Christ to his church, "Whose sins ye shall forgive, they are forgiven."

"Go in peace!" said the priest, and another and another came. Often before had these Christian savages, in their unsophisticated nature, made public confession of their faults, seeking to humble themselves before heaven and earth, and thus to show the sincerity of their repentance, and to do penance by mortifying their pride and self-love; now, therefore, they did not heed the presence of their brethren. Two there were who were yet unbaptized, two neophytes longing for the redeeming waters of the purifying sacrament. In turn they knelt and confessed themselves, and besought baptism. Alas! the good priest, bound hand and foot, without a drop of water, was unable to administer the sacred rite.

The pious occupation of the prisoners was at length interrupted by the entrance of a warrior, who was soon followed by another. It was not long before a number had gathered in the lodge. One of the Mohawks, at length, approached the Jesuit, and loosed the cords that bound him; then he released the young novice. Father Laval sat still for some moments, endeavoring to overcome the stiffness of his limbs. Whilst he remained in this position an Indian entered the lodge, bearing in his hand an ear of corn upon the stock, which he had just plucked; he threw it to the Jesuit. The sunlight played upon it as it lay—and see! upon its silken beard and broad blade clung little drops of dew *—sparkling and glis-

* This incident is related of Father Isaac Jogues while a captive among the Mohawks, by Bancroft, almost in the words used above. See *Bancroft*, vol. iii, p. 133.

tening, like jewels in the light! Ah! far more precious at that moment than all the diamonds of Golconda! There was enough to baptize the two captive Hurons. Taking it up carefully, he arose, zeal and joy overcoming pain and weakness, and knelt above the prostrate neophytes.

"O my children, the hand of the ever merciful is with us. Kneel—kneel!" and in the wild forest lodge, made holy as God's temple by the prayers and sufferings of his faithful children, with the Christian Huron and wild Mohawk looking on, without sponsor, with no lights but God's own sunlight, with no incense but the ineffably sweet incense of humble prayer, before the altar of the heart, the priest admitted the rejoicing neophytes into the fold of Christ, into the household of faith, sprinkling the pure dew of heaven upon their uplifted brows. Wondrously solemn was that simple baptism in the wilderness, in the midst of trials and sufferings, in the face of death. No swelling organ arose over the sacrament; no swinging bell pealed out; no white robe upon the neophyte, but the stainless one of purity of heart; no vestment on the priest but the martyr's, stained with blood.

"Come sorrow; come death," exclaimed the Jesuit; "I will heed them not, O God! for of thy mercy there is no end."

Scarcely had he finished before an Indian summoned him to follow him. Father Laval left the lodge. A group of boys were gathered before the door, and watched the priest with interest as he passed through them, but did not molest him. His conductor, crossing the open space around the lodge, turned his steps towards a tent at the end of the village near the forest. This rude dwelling of the savage was constructed of poles sunk in the ground, in a circle, with their tops bent to a common point and fastened together. Over this frame was stretched a canopy of buffalo skins, stitched together with thread made of the tendons of the deer. It was large and commodious, and betokened the wealth and standing of its owner. In front the two ends of the covering hung apart, leaving a space for entrance, which was usually closed up by a single buffalo robe suspended from a cross piece above. This was, of course, raised to admit light and air. The tent was of far better order than the lodges around it, which were rude huts covered with bark. The Indian motioned Father Laval to enter. Lying on a couch of skins, the Jesuit beheld the young chief whose wounds he had bound up on the field of battle. An old man sat near him; it was the father of Kiskepila, and the chief of the village. The priest approached the couch of the wounded man to feel his pulse, but the old man waved him away with a motion of his hand.

"Pale face!" he said in the Huron tongue, "you are the foe of the Mohawks, and yet you sought to heal the wounds of Kiskepila."

"I am the foe of no people," replied the Jesuit meekly; "my mission is to save, not to destroy."

"Thou art the friend of the Huron?" said the old man interrogatively.

"Dost thou see the sun?" said the priest. "The God who created it made it to shine alike upon the Huron and the Mohawk. Its beams ripen the corn in the country of the Iroquois, and in the lands beyond the great lakes. Will the Mohawk veil his eyes to the sunlight because its rays shine upon the Huron too?" The Indian was silent, and the Jesuit continued:

"The Great Spirit loves all his children, the Mohawk and the Huron; will the wise and brave Mohawk shut his ears to the words of the Great Spirit because the Huron has already heard them?"

"Pale face, the Mohawk listens to the voice of Owameeyo; he hears it in the forest, and in the waters, and in the winds!"

"The Great Spirit has taught us, sa-

chem, to love those who hate us—to love all men—to let our hearts shine on all like the sun of heaven!"

"*Hugh!*" exclaimed the Mohawk, "does the pale face speak with a forked tongue? The Iroquois *strikes* his enemy, and it is *good!*" and he laid his hand upon his heart.

Father Laval paused for a moment ere he answered this appeal to the natural passions of man as an argument against the truth of the Christian doctrine, and then, pointing to the wounded man, said: "Kiskepila sought the life of the pale face ——"

"And the pale face saved the life of Kiskepila," interrupted the young brave in a tone of deep feeling. "The words of the blackgown are true. The wolf kills the deer, the bear the buffalo, the hawk the dove, and the Mohawk his wounded foe. It is only the pale face—the blackgown—that binds up the wounds of his enemy. His heart is gentle as the summer breeze!"

Silence ensued, for the Indian scarcely knew how to receive and estimate the wonderful magnanimity of Christianity. Nature taught him to do good for good; to return good for evil was a new thought to him, yet it awoke a slumbering chord of the heart; he began to feel the sublimity of the precept, and was silent. At this point of the conversation a squaw entered the lodge, bearing several ears of young corn, and a quantity of beans which had been roasted at a fire without, and placed them on a mat upon the floor.

"Eat!" said the chief. Father Laval approached, and making the sign of the cross, blessed the simple provisions which had been offered to him, and then proceeded to satisfy his famished appetite. Hitherto he had been furnished with barely enough food to support his strength, for it was a common mode of torture among the Indians to make their prisoners pass days and nights together with barely enough food to sustain life, and yet inflict an incredible amount of suffering. Yet he ate moderately. A gourd of water was placed beside him—he had not slaked his thirst for many hours—it was grateful to his burning lips. Having returned thanks to God, he arose and approached the couch. The chief again spoke: "The pale face made a sign upon his forehead?"

"It was the sign of the cross," replied the Jesuit.

The chief nodded his head affirmatively. "I thank the Great Spirit for his gifts."

Then the Jesuit began to examine the wounds of Kiskepila, and to bind them anew, all the while explaining the meaning of the holy symbol which he had used; how God had sent his Son on earth after the sin of our first parents, and how his chosen people had scourged and put him to death upon the cross, and how, ever since then, his followers had used that sign to recall to their minds the recollection of his agony and death.

"Ugh! Dogs!" exclaimed Kiskepila, as he shook his clenched fist. The old chief listened with a look of incredulity.

While the priest was speaking a figure glided softly in at the opening of the tent, and crouched silently in an obscure corner with the females of the family. Morning Flower listened: she could understand but little, for he spoke in the Huron dialect. In astonishment, she gazed upon him as he tenderly bound up the wounds of her lover. The passion of the previous evening had subsided, and she remembered with a sorrowing heart that she had tortured him in the gauntlet. Hers was a gentle spirit in spite of its wild education. She arose, approached the priest, and looked him in the face; at the same moment the young warrior, pointing to the Jesuit, said:

"Morning Flower, the blackrobe saved the life of Kiskepila when the Young Eagle had slain his people—the Hurons."

Then the heart of the woman was true, and, in spite of early habits and barbarous training, beat there as nature made it. A

gush of remorse filled her soul, and with a low wild cry she broke away from the tent. The two Mohawks looked at each other in astonishment, unable to comprehend the cause of so singular an exhibition of feeling; and the elder exclaimed in a low tone, "Hugh! Medicine!" and shook his head, attributing the action of the girl to some species of enchantment on the part of the priest. But Father Laval well understood it: he recognised the maiden who had so relentlessly pursued him whilst running the gauntlet: yet he continued the conversation, without heeding the circumstance farther.

At length the Jesuit returned to the council lodge, where he busied himself in ministering to the wounded Hurons. René Bourdoise, released from the tight bonds which had been so painful, began to recover a little from the weakness that had rendered him so helpless. With a tottering step he descended to the stream, and washed the blood from his face and hands, and laved his swollen feet. The cool water refreshed and strengthened him, calming the fever of his veins. He found a gourd upon the bank, and, filling it, bore it to the famished prisoners at the lodge. The Jesuit assisted the novice, unheeded by the Mohawks, who listlessly reclined on the grass, occasionally casting a glance upon the prisoners, to see that no attempt was made to loosen their bonds.

Towards evening the Jesuit again entered the tent of Kiodego. Kiskepila was resting in a half recumbent position, supported by a pile of furs that a king might have envied. Many days had passed since his wounds had been received, for the march was long and tedious, and he was now recruiting his strength. Father Laval again felt his pulse, for he feared lest the fatigue of a long journey, upon a rough litter, might bring on a fever which would prove fatal; but a skilful preparation of draughts from herbs and roots had prevented it: the stroke was still calm and regular. Then he entered into conversation with the young brave, using as much as possible the Mohawk tongue, earnestly seeking to become familiar with it for "the greater glory of God." In the tedious and painful route he had caught a knowledge of it from his captors, and its affinity with the Huron tongue, which he spoke with ease and fluency, enabled him to make rapid progress. The young warrior listened to him patiently, but as soon as he paused addressed him:

"Blackgown, you have taught me that the pale face loves all, and forgives those who have injured him.—Morning Flower,"—and the young maiden, springing up from a group of females in the farther part of the tent, approached and stood beside the priest,—"Morning Flower, when the blood of Kiskepila was flowing from his veins, and his heart was growing cold, the hand of the pale face stopped its flow. Blackgown, Morning Flower is the destined bride of Kiskepila."

The priest placed his hands upon the head of the young girl, and then, raising them up to heaven, uttered a prayer for the wild but gentle spirit before him. "O God, grant that the light of thy faith may pierce the heart of this untutored girl, and of all here. Mary, mother of the sorrowful, bring these wanderers to the faith of thy Son by the powerful intercession of thy prayers. And he added in the Mohawk tongue, "Daughter, peace be with thee."

Then Father Laval began to discourse again upon the subject of his morning's conversation, speaking in the Mohawk dialect as well as he could. Kiskepila listened attentively, and the maiden, seated at her lover's feet, gathered every word that fell from the lips of the priest.

When the Jesuit had departed, the young warrior conversed with Morning Flower upon the discourse which they had heard, explaining such portions as had been uttered in the Huron dialect, and wondering over that which was mysterious and difficult, for it is hard to express abstract ideas in the Indian language. The

kindness and attention of the missionary had won the heart of the young Iroquois, and, finding that he acted out in his own life what he taught to others, under the impulse of a grateful feeling, he lent a willing ear to his words. Kiskepila had a clear head, and the very fact that the Jesuit faced so many dangers, and endured so much toil and suffering, to preach the doctrines of his religion, satisfied him at once of the uprightness and sincerity of his motives. The skill and knowledge of the Frenchman proved to him that he was no ordinary man, and he inclined to believe even the wonderful tidings he announced. Yet doubts met him at every point as he thought over the strange things he had been told. When, therefore, the Jesuit entered the tent on the following day, he questioned him:

"Blackgown, you tell me that the Saviour died and was buried, and that on the third day he arose again from the dead. I have never seen the dead arise—how can I believe it?"

"My son, it would have been no proof of his divinity if rising from the dead had been an ordinary occurrence. But he is God. He it was who made the law that all men should die, and that law he could suspend or alter. As man he died; as God-man he arose. The people of thy tribe believe that the spirits of the departed do not die; can not the God who preserves the spirit preserve also the body, and give it back to life? Can he not at a word bid the tomb to open, and the lifeless corpse to live and breathe again? Ah, my son! there are no laws to bind the Omnipotent God but the laws of his own mercy and justice and eternal providence. He has been pleased to listen to the prayer of his humble followers upon this earth, and has for them wrought miracles almost equally wonderful. The Blessed Xavier, on the shore of the far east, knelt and prayed, and the ear of the Almighty was inclined towards him, and when the holy priest stretched forth his hand, and called upon the dead to come forth from his silent grave, the lifeless sprang up into strength and health and beauty."

A deep exclamation of surprise broke from the lips of the attentive Indian, whilst the women of the family gathered nearer to hear the words of the animated speaker. Warmed with a holy zeal, the Jesuit continued in a clear firm voice:

"The resurrection of the Saviour from the dead was to be the final seal of salvation; it was to open the way for us from the tomb to heaven!"

Then Father Laval went on to tell how, ages before his coming, the mode of his birth, his suffering, the miracles which he was to perform, his passion and his death had been foretold, and how exactly they had been accomplished; and he summed up all the evidences of Christianity, while the young warrior listened attentively, often bowing his head in token of assent.

"Yes, it must be true," he said at length, after the Jesuit had concluded: "Kiskepila must believe."

Thus Father Laval sought every opportunity to impress upon the mind of the young warrior the truths of Christianity, and the relation which existed between them made the young Iroquois listen with a docility unexampled among that fierce race. Whatever the young man learned he was sure to communicate to Morning Flower, who soon began to seek occasions of conversing with the priest, and listened with admiration to his accounts of the splendor of the cities of France, and the number of their inhabitants, things like the wonders of fairy tales to her unsophisticated imagination. With these accounts the priest always mingled descriptions of the splendid churches and of the gorgeous ceremonial, of the sacred rites performed within them, to the honor and glory of God, and explained them to the maiden as well as he could in his imperfect knowledge of the language. Then, leaving these subjects, he would converse upon the moral relations of Christian society, instruct her in the duties of woman, and teach her the obligations of religion,

the sanctity of marriage, and the beauty and holiness of purity of heart and body. Morning Flower drank in his words, and kept them in her heart. But this was the work of days. In the meanwhile the village was filled with various accounts of the conversations which the priest had held in the tent of Kiodego—how he had spoken of wonderful and mysterious things, and how he had said that the fathers of the blackgown, in times not long gone by, had called the dead from their tombs. These reports, increased and distorted as they passed from mouth to mouth, cast a species of awe around the priest in the eyes of many. He began to be looked upon as a magician or medicine more powerful than their own. Yet unconscious of all this, the humble Jesuit pursued his labors with increasing assiduity.

REPLY OF J. P. KENNEDY TO HIS REVIEWER.

TO THE EDITORS OF THE UNITED STATES CATHOLIC MAGAZINE AND MONTHLY REVIEW.

Gentlemen:

HAVE a dislike to all literary controversy; and something more than dislike when my antagonist is a professional critic. I know that towards such a personage an author does wisely to show no contumacy,—for, whatever may be the merits of the dispute, the critic is sure to have the last word, which is equally sure to be more bitter than the first. In his vocation, the sense of having done injustice is generally a motive to repeat the injury. It is not, therefore, to convert the reviewer of my "Discourse on the Life and Character of George Calvert" to a more favorable opinion of that production that I desire the use of your journal; but to correct some of his misrepresentations, to set myself right before your readers in regard to matters where he has set me particularly wrong, and to open to their view some points of history concerning which he seems to have studiously endeavored to keep them in the dark.

When I delivered the Discourse I was not aware that I was touching upon a subject which might not be handled as freely as any other question of history. Still less was I aware that I was about to bring the Maryland Historical Society under censure for their toleration of my production; and, least of all, that I was laying that society under an obligation to make an *amende* to any one for the wrong they were about to do in publishing it.

In these particulars I find I have been mistaken. The elaborate review, with which I have been honored in the April number of your Magazine, is written in a tone of rebuke which I can only understand as an admonition against the rashness of having an opinion of my own upon the subject I had chosen: whilst both the review itself and your editorial notice of it convey a very intelligible hint of the misdoings of the Historical Society in publishing the Discourse, their responsibility for its "sentiments," and their duty to make "some amende" to somebody for the offence of this "extraordinary performance."

I have no design to vindicate the society for their part in this transgression. They will think of it, perhaps, when they come to print another address. Neither am I inclined to defend myself against the as-

perity of the reviewer upon the literary merit of my performance. Measured by the standard of his severe taste, I am willing to confess my inferiority. I have nothing to object to his want of amiability: it is a critic's privilege to show his spleen, and almost his nature to be personally offensive. I can make all allowance for his indulgence of a reasonable amount of ill nature, and set it down to the constitutional or professional irritability of his class. But I have, in common with every other citizen of Maryland, and especially of every other native of the state, some concern with the manner in which he has thought proper to dispose of what relates to our early history and the right of investigating it.

The Historical Society was instituted chiefly for the purpose of collecting the materials which may serve to illustrate the history of Maryland. In the performance of this office, it is no part of its plan to suppress or distort any facts which it may be able to disclose. Its object is truth, not panegyric; and its labors are addressed to their appropriate subject, not without a presentiment that our annals must exhibit the usual variety of topics for condemnation as well as topics for applause. It is, nevertheless, encouraged to explore those annals from a belief that, in the most unrestricted freedom of inquiry, what shall be found good or what bad may be turned to the account of useful example or not less useful admonition; and especially is it encouraged to this inquiry from the clearest conviction that Maryland can very well afford to have her story disclosed exactly as the truth shall warrant, without abating any thing from her just pride in her ancestry; with increase rather of that feeling.

This would seem to be obvious enough if the reviewer had not called this license of inquiry into question. He manifestly supposes that a native of Maryland is guilty of something like impiety when he ventures to doubt even a theory of assumed merit in the founder. They who are born in Baltimore must, through the mere virture of the name, take for true any fable that is supposed to enhance the merit of one of the Baltimore family. We of Maryland are specially bound on this score to uphold Henrietta Maria; Annapolis is pledged in like manner to the fame of Anne; and the city of Frederick would be unnatural if it did not sustain the last lord proprietary against all the disparagements of history. This principle I take to be involved in the reviewer's allusion to my duty as a "native" of Baltimore. Now, when he holds me up to public observation in that character with a purpose to accuse me of "an ungracious office" in representing the first Lord Baltimore in any light which I might conceive truth to require; when he charges such an act to be "unfilial," and as manifesting a want of "love for my native state," he not only endeavors to denounce and proscribe me for the exercise of my right of judgment, but, what is much more exceptionable, he makes a direct assault upon that privilege which alone sustains the integrity of history. We can only infer from it that, in reference to our native land, he deems the historian bound to silence when he can not praise, or to misrepresentation when facts do not concur to support the reviewer's preconceptions of the merit of the subject. If this be an honest canon of criticism, all truthful history must be handed over to foreigners; the native American is foreclosed.

I submit to no such domination. If our history be unworthy of praise, let it abide the censure of the world. If our predecessors be not entitled to the applause of posterity, let posterity vindicate their own preëminence by their preference of truth over that mean glory which has no basis but falsehood. I utterly repudiate that school which first makes history sentimental in order that it may make it fulsome, and, therefore, false. This I say by way of comment on the *morality* of the reviewer's reference to my duty as a na-

tive of the state; whilst, at the same time, I deny that I have, in any respect, derogated from the just fame or proper merit of Lord Baltimore.

I have other objections to the general character and assumptions of the review. It is written in a sectarian spirit, wanting essentially in liberality and candor. Its temper is polemic. It aims to convert a point of history into a question affecting the honor of the church, and in that pursuit it lapses into intolerance. It displays an eager exasperation against the author of the Discourse for no better reason than for differing from the reviewer upon an historical fact, and, giving that fact a religious hue, it will not extend to the opponent the courtesy of considering his difference of opinion honest. I am, consequently, charged with "professional adroitness to make the worse appear the better cause," with "torturing good and honorable motives into bad," with "using the privilege of a novelist to make the coinage of my own fancy pass for truth," and other such like periphrases which have become the prescriptive language of irritated cant ever since criticism fell into the hands of gentlemen who could not keep their temper.

I hope I need not say to those of calmer nature than the critic that I had no idea of making a church quarrel out of my Discourse; that I had no purpose to offend any man's religious predilections, nor to stir up the embers of that immemorial feud between two great churches, which unfortunately finds fuel enough without supply from me. I have great respect for the combatants on both sides of that battle ground when they are in the due pursuit of Christian duty; but when they come to cross words, I desire to be considered a neutral in the field. I take no sides. Not even the vituperation of the review can make me a partisan. I wrote the history of Calvert according to the best view I could get of the facts, without the slightest imaginable prejudice or inclination in regard to his religion. I should have slept as sound and been altogether as happy if my researches had proved him to be whatever the favorite theory of the reviewer might demand, as to be any thing else in all the categories of historical character. Indeed, for the sake of peace and the avoiding of wrath, as it has turned out, I should have preferred to find him exactly what the critic is determined he shall be.

But to be taken to task, as I have been, because I could not falsify my own convictions of the fact, and *in the manner* especially of the review, I hold that to be an invasion of my right. It argues pretensions which no intelligent citizen of Maryland, whether he be Catholic or Protestant, will, at this day, endure. They do not belong to the nineteenth century, nor to enlightened Christendom. I protest against them as hurtful to the cause of religion in whatsoever creed, and as offensive to the intellectual freedom of the age.

I have another charge to make against the reviewer. He has totally misrepresented, I should more properly say concealed, the light in which the Discourse has exhibited Calvert. With abundant industry to collate passages from the Discourse, for the purpose of wresting from them unfavorable deductions as to my view of the conduct of the founder of Maryland, he has not, in a single instance, quoted an expression of mine where my object was to commend the character of the subject. So far from giving me credit for the general as well as discriminate praise by which I have endeavored to exalt the fame of Lord Baltimore, he has taken some pains, in a brief reference to that point, to dismiss it with a sneer, that, although "worthy of the author's best days," it "almost tempts us to suspect it was composed for some other occasion."

A candid critic would have at least endeavored to present an outline of my estimate of the character, motives, and conduct of the subject of my Discourse: he would have occasionally allowed me to

speak for myself, by using my own language: he would have stated my points, and shown something of my reasoning upon the facts I had adduced; and, above all, he would not have withheld an accurate representation of my side of the question where it differed from his own view of it. I look in vain for such evidences of fairness in the review. A reader of that paper would suppose I had maliciously taken up my pen with no other purpose than to traduce the memory of Calvert, and that, in the face of the most *unquestionable* history, I had labored to exhibit him as "a selfish and despotic statesman," "a sycophant or knave in politics," "an interested speculator in charters," and "a temporizing hypocrite in religion."

Whether I have succeeded in this charitable office or not, can only be determined by the perusal of my Discourse itself, to which, rather than overload this communication with extracts from it, I must beg leave to refer your readers. And, in the meantime, I affirm that this picture of my Discourse is but the discoloration of an excited and somewhat distempered zeal, as, I think, every dispassionate man will say after he has read what I have written.

Before I come to the discussion of the principal topics which the reviewer has selected for the grounds of his attack upon my fidelity of representation, it is proper that I should exhibit an outline of what I hold to be the best ascertained facts in the life of Calvert. We may form our opinions of his character afterwards.

Calvert, at about twenty-five years of age, came into public service as the private secretary of Sir Robert Cecil,* a minister of state to James I. After the death of the minister he was made a clerk of the crown to the privy council, and, at the same time, received the honor of knighthood. In 1619 he was appointed one of the secretaries of state, the other being Sir Robert Naunton. In the next year he was elected to the house of commons from Yorkshire; served that constituency during one parliament, and, being defeated for the next, in Yorkshire, was returned from Oxford. He continued to be secretary of state until near the end of the reign of James, when, in 1625, he resigned; was continued as a member of the privy council, and created baron of Baltimore. In 1609—and how long previous to that period we do not know—he was a member of the Virginia company of planters; was still a member of it in 1620, and, on the 15th of July, 1624, was one of the provisional council in England erected for the temporary government of that province. In 1621, and, perhaps, before that date, he became interested in a plantation in Newfoundland; in that year (1621) sent out a colony there at his own expense, and continued for some years afterwards to lay out considerable sums of money upon it. After his resignation, he visited Newfoundland in person for the first time, and, previous to the year 1630, resided on the island with his family some two or three years. Not finding the climate and position of Newfoundland favorable to his scheme of plantation, he repaired to Virginia, in 1628, with a view to make a settlement there, but being uncourteously received by the authorities of the province, he continued his quest of a settlement into Maryland; returned to England, and finally, in 1632, obtained his charter for this province from Charles I, but died a few weeks before the royal seal was put to it.

This, I believe, is an outline of facts upon which all historians are agreed. I have said nothing in this sketch about his opinions, either political or religious, because they constitute the questions upon which the reviewer has come into conflict with the Discourse. In regard to these, I have endeavored to show that his political opinions were on the court side, and against what was called the country party:

* I take this occasion to correct an error which will be found in the Discourse, and which has escaped the observation of the critic. I have described Sir Robert Cecil as "lord treasurer, afterwards earl of Salisbury." He was first created earl of Salisbury, and afterwards lord treasurer.

that he was the advocate of Prerogative, as known in the days of King James, against the Privilege of that period. Upon what grounds I have made this statement, I may show hereafter. His religious opinions I have endeavored also to trace through his history, and to show that, according to the better judgment, he was, most probably from an early period of his life, a Roman Catholic. That, living at a time of very severe proscription of that religion, he followed the example of many eminent and excellent persons in giving as little publicity to his religious tenets as possible in the position he occupied. That he was favored in this design by the friendship of the king, by whom he was affectionately regarded as an able and upright servant. Speaking of him, in reference to this view of his career, I have said: "I much rather incline to the belief, without in any degree derogating from his integrity, that he was one of those who did not choose to make any very public exhibition of his faith, preferring the peace and security of private worship to the hazard and contention which a too open manifestation of it might bring. That being a man of moderate opinions, tolerant and unassuming, a sensible and discreet man, enjoying the confidence, and diligently employed in the service of the king, he thought it the part of prudence to keep his religion as much as possible confined to the privacy of his own chamber."

What warrant I may have for this view of his character I shall exhibit hereafter somewhat at large. Now, taking Calvert in the light which the facts I have referred to, and the opinions I have assigned to him afford, I have represented him to be, in the first place, a zealous and devoted friend to the general schemes of colonization in America, which constituted, to a certain extent, the passion of that age: that he indulged this taste "with great assiduity, personal devotion, and at heavy pecuniary charge;" that, in doing so, "his purpose was, in part, the advancement of his own reputation, the increase of the wealth of his family, and a laudable and pious zeal for extending the Christian religion and the territories of the British empire."

I have, in the next place, exhibited him in the light of an adroit, skilful statesman, "characterized not less by the politic management than by the vigor with which he prosecuted his designs," a man "of courage, energy, and skill in the management of men." "The posts which he filled," says the Discourse, "his position and conduct in parliament, the favor and esteem he seems always to have inspired, demonstrate his ability, as well as his prudence, and give us reason to infer an amiable, well bred and affable disposition: the character of the government he established in Maryland, and the just sentiments with which he seems to have inspired his son, and the lavish expenditure which he, doubtless, both authorized and provided before his death, attest his liberal views of the rights of conscience, his generosity, and his zeal in the cause of colonization."

In the third place, I have exhibited him, in the character of a founder of a state, who, although decidedly inclined to support the high doctrines of Prerogative and enlisted rather against the popular party, and, although armed with very strong powers of government, was yet a man of such respect for justice, so moderate, wise, and upright in the administration of power, as to provide a system of administration eminently adapted to the protection of the civil and religious rights of the people over whom his authority was to be exercised. I have said that the charter was "planned by Lord Baltimore, and carried into execution by him and his sons, in a spirit of the broadest and most liberal toleration;" and I have referred to facts, which I have narrated in the Discourse, to show "how justly the father conceived the plan of a benignant government, and how faithfully the son carried it into execution."

And, lastly, that I might not fail in rendering the highest honor to the Catholic

settlers of Maryland, for the first example in the world of a state founded upon the principles of true religious toleration, and that I might express my full appreciation of the glory to which they were entitled, I have said—what the reviewer seems very strangely to find fault with—that the "glory of Maryland toleration is in the charter, and not in the act of 1649;" which act was, in truth, that of, what is supposed to be, the first Protestant legislature aided by the first Protestant governor, and which neither originated nor established the toleration of Maryland, nor even protected the people from a very harsh intolerance that immediately followed it. In paying this tribute of applause to the Catholic founders, I have almost repeated that sentiment which the reviewer—in a vain attempt to show that my opinions "have undergone a remarkable change within the last eight years"—has extracted from Rob of the Bowl. Commenting, in the Discourse, on this "wisely planned and honestly executed scheme of society,"* I have used this language:

"Where have we such a spectacle in that age? All the world was intolerant of religious opinion but this little band of adventurers, who, under the guidance of young Leonard Calvert, committed their fortunes to the Ark and the Dove, and entered Maryland between St. Michael and St. Joseph, (St. Gregory I ought to have said,) as they denominated the two headlands of the Potomac, the portals to that little wilderness which was to become the home of their posterity. All the world outside of these portals was intolerant, proscriptive, vengeful against the children of a dissenting faith. Here only, in Maryland, throughout the wide world of Christendom, was there an altar erected and truly dedicated to the freedom of Christian worship. Let those who first reared it enjoy the renown to which it has entitled them."

One would suppose that a limner who drew such pictures of a personage of history and of his friends, might escape the charge of any very flagrant detraction; that, at least, it might be supposed there was no design to portray the principal figure as a sycophant, a knave, or a hypocrite.

There was one point, however, in the history of Calvert, as it has been sometimes, and especially of late years, represented, upon which I ventured to suggest a doubt; upon which, indeed, I gathered such evidence as I thought justified me in denying it altogether. This was the story of the conversion of Lord Baltimore, in the year 1624–5, from the Protestant to the Catholic faith. This doubt, and the arguments I have brought to sustain it, seem to have particularly stirred up the reviewer's spleen against the Discourse: they furnish the key to the secret of his acrimony. It is not difficult to perceive, notwithstanding the pains he has taken to controvert the Discourse in all its parts and topics, that upon this single question of the conversion, he has put the determination of the chief merit or demerit of Calvert. The reviewer's belief in the conversion at the period assigned to it, obviously settles his estimate of whatever there is praiseworthy in the character of the subject of the Discourse. The conversion once disproved—rejected from the history of Calvert, the critic can only regard him as unworthy of respect. My want of faith in this story, the most casual reader of the review will see, leads the writer of that paper to the conclusion that I have represented Calvert as no better than a hypocrite and a sycophant. Upon this foundation I am accused of desecrating all history, writing "in opposition to the records," coolly demolishing

* These words the reviewer has quoted from Rob of the Bowl, to convict me of contradicting them in the Discourse. Whatever were the powers conveyed to the proprietary by the *charter*, undoubtedly the whole practical scheme of the settlement, as manifested in the conduct of the settlers, was benignant; their polity was wisely planned and honestly executed. It is a little singular that the critic, who charges me with using, in my historical narrative, the privilege of a novelist, should refer to my romance to impugn my history.

"the character of Lord Baltimore," putting "forward my own conceits *in opposition to all historians who have treated of the subject,*" and, finally, discrediting a fact "*which has been unquestioned for two centuries.*"

It becomes my duty, under this charge of falsifying what was so well established, to examine the evidence somewhat minutely. When I have done so, the reader will be able to judge both of the ingenuousness of the critic, and of the propriety and point of his indignation.

As a preliminary, then, I wish it to be noted that my allegation is—that Calvert did not become a *convert* to the Catholic faith in 1624–5; that he was known to be a Catholic in 1621; that he was even known to be a Catholic before this last date; and, in fact, that we have no authentic account of any period of his life when it was known that he was not a Catholic; or, to use the phrase of the Discourse, "if he ever was a Protestant, there is no record of it within our knowledge."

Now, if this be true, it will follow, first, that Calvert did not resign his office of secretary of state for the reason assigned by Fuller; second, that he had no scruples, arising out of his religion, to prevent him from serving as secretary of state; third, that he was a member of parliament, a representative from Yorkshire first, and then from Oxford, notwithstanding his religious opinions; and lastly, that he maintained himself in the confidence of the king, and in the service of the state, exactly as I have represented him, amidst the difficulties of that perilous time, by his address, by his moderation, or by the respect he had won through the faithful discharge of his trust.

The reviewer thinks he could not have been a Catholic whilst he held these employments and attracted this confidence, without being a dissembler and a hypocrite. I can, by no means, agree to this conclusion. His hypocrisy can only be measured by the extent of his professions. I prefer to conclude that he did not profess much. The critic makes rather a dangerous issue for Calvert's fame, and is no friend of his when he places him in this dilemma. That, however, I leave to himself: my province is to give my authority for what I have said. It may turn out, in the end, that, so far from traducing Lord Baltimore, I have entertained a better opinion of him than the reviewer.

And now to inquire into the fact. I assert that the *only* authority for the conversion is Fuller; that all writers who have spoken of it have taken it from him. If there be a biographer or historian who mentions the conversion upon any other authority than that of the short sketch contained in the "Worthies of England," let the reviewer name him and produce his proof. I know of none.

Fuller's notice of Calvert is brief, scarcely filling one page: it is inaccurate and defective in known particulars. It is written apparently upon mere report, and makes no reference to any other writer. His narrative, so far as the conversion is concerned, is literally quoted in the Discourse. These are his words: "This place" (the secretary of state) "he discharged above five years, until he willingly resigned the same, 1624, on this occasion.—He freely confessed himself to the king, that he was then become a Roman Catholic, so that he must either be wanting in his trust, or violate his conscience in discharging his office. This his ingenuity so highly affected King James that he continued him privy counsellor all his reign, (as appeareth in the council book,) and soon after created him Lord Baltimore of Baltimore in Ireland."

This is every word that Fuller has said upon the subject.

It is admitted that Calvert was appointed secretary of state February 15, 1619, according to our calendar. It is also admitted that he was created Lord Baltimore February 16, 1625, six years after his former appointment. He resigned a short time before this latter date,

according to Fuller, *because* he had then become a Catholic.

I have asked, in my Discourse, why should he resign for this reason? I ask it again. Was there any incompatibility in such an employment with the profession of the Catholic religion? Is there any intelligent Catholic who is willing to acknowledge that his religion disqualified a British subject from faithfully serving his king and country in such a post as that of the secretary of state? I am convinced no Catholic will so libel his own faith as to answer this question in the affirmative. The secretary of state was, in effect, but the private, confidential secretary of the king. His duties had no connection with any article of faith, and there was intrinsically no more reason why Calvert should abandon his trust on such an occasion, than he should abandon any other post of duty under the government. To maintain that because he was a Catholic he could not faithfully discharge the duties of such an office, would be to furnish some justification for that proscription of the Catholics which all right-minded men now consider to have been a foul and unjustifiable persecution. Why should Calvert resign? One would suppose, looking to the history of James' reign at that date, that Calvert, so far from finding a motive to resign, would have seen the strongest reason, as a Catholic, to remain at his post. The negotiations for the Spanish match, which were intimately associated with a hope of procuring a relaxation of the penal laws against the Catholics, had just failed. Calvert had been an active and zealous friend of that match, and of course had labored in the cause of his Catholic fellow subjects to secure, if possible, their welfare. The marriage of the prince of Wales to a Catholic princess of France—Henrietta Maria—was at this time in a progress of busy consultation and arrangement. Like the Spanish project, it also fostered the hope of relief to the Catholics of England. This question of relief was in constant discussion. The king was well inclined to it, but was opposed by several of his counsellors. Was this a time for Calvert to resign, because he had become a Catholic? Certainly not. It was the very time when, if he had the option to remain, it was his most conscientious duty to hold fast to his post. The most probable view of his case—that most consistent with the history of the period—is that he was *compelled* to resign, not by the king, but by the party of the duke of Buckingham. It is known that parliament had just before this period complained to the king of the number of Catholics in public employment, and had called upon him to dismiss them. Calvert saw that he could no longer remain in office; that an inquisition was about to be made which would have constrained him to avow himself to be—what those who were conversant with him in private had previously known him to be—a Roman Catholic. His moderation, his reserve, his faithful attention to business, and his keeping himself, as one of his biographers has said, "disengaged from all interests," would no longer avail him. The question as to his religion was about to be so directly put as to leave him no alternative between a frank avowal of the truth and utter disgrace, through a base apostasy. His escape from this predicament was the open declaration of his faith, and his immediate resignation. This would seem to be the foundation of Fuller's story, and all that is really true in it. What follows in Fuller's account is mere gossip, and is calculated to bring into discredit all that he has said. He relates that the king was so pleased with this "his ingenuity" (ingenuousness), that for that reason he retained him in the privy council, and made him Lord Baltimore. If Calvert's conscience would not allow him to hold the post of secretary of state, how did it serve him as a member of the privy council? The two offices, in the nature of their duties, are identical. A secretary of state and a member of the king's council were equally

confidential advisers and actors with the king in his most delicate state affairs: there is no conceivable obligation, arising out of religious opinion, which is not as applicable to one as to the other. No new oath was to be taken in either case; and if the implied incompatibility of the oath taken by Calvert some years before, with the relations which are supposed to have been created by his conversion, made it a point of honor, as the reviewer insinuates, for Calvert to resign the secretaryship, the same fact existed to compel him to resign his membership in the privy council.

And then we are asked, also, to believe that, for "this his ingenuity," the king created him a baron! Need I show, from the character and conduct of James, that the last act of grace that could possibly be imputed to *him* would be the public rewarding of one of his own household, for the frank confession of a conversion from the Protestant to the Catholic faith? Nothing is more notorious in history than the absurd vanity of James to be accounted a great theologian. He resented no offence with so much sensibility as the contumacy of those who, in defiance of his discourses and teachings, slid off from that faith of which he considered himself, peculiarly and eminently, The Defender. When the delinquent, in this wise, was one of his own household, an intimate who lived within the sound of the royal voice, the displeasure was proportioned to the additional depravity which could disdain such signal advantages. This is the foundation of that hostility against all *converts* to the Catholic church, to which I have referred in my Discourse, and of which I have there given some proofs. Tillieres, the French embassador at the court of James, in his report to his own government, dated 5th June, 1622, alluding to this sensibility in the king, speaks thus:

"I have written to you in my last letter that the countess of Buckingham was become a Catholic. When the king, and the marquess her son, learned this, they conceived the highest dissatisfaction; the former as an enemy of our religion, and because *it seemed to him a great discredit that a lady of his court*, the mother of his favorite, *with whom he himself* (and he holds himself for a doctor in theology) *had so often and so particularly spoken, should abandon her faith:* Buckingham, because he knows *that if any thing upon earth could undermine his favor, or give it a shock*, this very accident is of that description."*

Now, this is the king who, we are to believe, *rewarded* Calvert, by promoting him to the peerage, because, in contempt of the royal logic, and under the preacher's very eye, he abandoned his ancient faith, and freely confessed it to the king himself!

The resignation of Calvert, I have no doubt, was compulsory, forced upon him by the temper of parliament and the course taken by the adherents of the duke of Buckingham, who was no friend to Calvert. The grant of the peerage and his continuance in the privy council, I regard as the emollients with which James assayed to soothe Calvert's pride, and to express to him the royal appreciation of his faithful and devoted service. The secretary, in truth, had not the position or influence at court to enable him to resist the pressure of a party which was even strong enough to intimidate the king. Tillieres says of Calvert: "He is an honorable, sensible, well-minded man, courteous towards strangers, full of respect towards embassadors, zealously intent upon the welfare of England; but, by reason of all these good qualities, *entirely without consideration or influence.*"†

I have stated my objections, thus particularly, to Fuller's account of the conversion of Calvert, not only because the reviewer lays great stress upon it as the "positive testimony of a veracious witness," who speaks of facts "which

* Von Raumur's Hist. Sixteenth and Seventeenth Centuries, vol. ii, p. 271.
† Von Raumur, vol. ii, 263.

occurred in his own time," but because, also, as I have already said, it is the only explicit testimony upon which the conversion rests, and constitutes, therefore, the only foundation for what is called in the review the *unquestioned* history of two centuries.

It is true there is an attempt made by the reviewer to help out this incongruous story of Fuller's by a few desperate tugs at some other accessible facts which, very obviously, are not sufficiently elastic for his purpose. All his straining will not bring them even within gun-shot of his mark. Indeed, in this matter, I have to charge the reviewer with something of an old soldier's tactics,—concerning the fairness of which I have no comment to make. The reviewer may think that criticism approaches so nearly to a state of war as to legalize an occasional resort to stratagem to make up for deficiency of force.

Fuller being the only direct witness, it was a matter of some concern to invest his narrative with as much authority as possible, and so to state it as to give it the credit due to one who knew all about the fact. The critic, therefore, speaks of him as almost entitled to be regarded as an eye-witness of Calvert's life. "He is an author," says the review, "of great respectability, and was, withal, so decidedly opposed to the Catholic religion, that he would not have mentioned so remarkable an occurrence had there been the *least doubt* of it; nor would he have omitted to state Calvert's hypocrisy or dissimulation had he been a concealed Catholic. Mr. K. admits that Fuller was his contemporary; *he had, then, the best means of ascertaining the truth of what he asserts in his history.*"

The point of this paragraph is the attempt to give Fuller's testimony the importance and weight of that of a person who could not be mistaken; and my admission that he was a contemporary of Calvert is used to aid its effect. The critic ought, therefore, to have stated my admission truly. My words were these: "The author of the Worthies of England was his contemporary, *though thirty years his junior, and it is of some moment to my argument to remark, was obviously not personally acquainted with him.*" It would have conduced to the candor, though not to the strength of the critic's case, if he had stated this admission with the qualification I gave to it—a qualification made expressly to show that he had *not* "the best means of ascertaining the truth of what he asserts."

Fuller is an amusing, witty, and industrious writer, who is not generally deemed of the highest authority. His book is written in a gossipping style, bearing many evidences of carelessness and haste, and is altogether too light in its character to be relied on for accurate history. How far his sketch of Calvert will justify the assertion of the reviewer, that "he would not have mentioned so remarkable an occurrence had there been the *least doubt of it*," will appear presently.

The most careful biographer of that period—perhaps the only one to be trusted—is Anthony Wood. The Athenæ Oxonienses are written with abundant labor, and with a large amount of critical research. Wood, moreover, is somewhat noted for his endeavor towards impartiality in speaking of the Catholics—a fact which the zealots of his time were disposed to use to his disadvantage. I might say, therefore, adopting the same kind of argument as that employed by the reviewer, that if "so remarkable an occurrence" as that of the conversion and its consequences had been true, much more if there had not been "the least doubt of it," Wood would not have failed to mention it,—particularly as he had Fuller's work at hand to lead him to investigate the fact. Yet Wood speaks of Calvert precisely as we might suppose a cautious biographer would speak of one whose religion had been rather concealed from public notice, and thereby laid under suspicion, or regarded with doubt, during

such a period as that embraced in the life of this statesman. He does not say Calvert was known to be a Catholic, nor does he affirm the reverse. His statement is, that on the 16th of February, 1624, (1625 N. S.) he was created baron of Baltimore, "being then a Roman Catholic, or, *at least, very much addicted to their religion.*"

What do we gather from this as Wood's opinion of Fuller's story of the frank confession, the "ingenuity," and the great gratification of the king who rewarded so much honesty in so signal a manner? Very clearly, that he did not believe a word of it. All that he felt himself justified in affirming was that Calvert was then a Roman Catholic, or at least favorably inclined to that religion.—This is what the reviewer regards as corroborating the statement of Fuller!

But he has found another authentication of Fuller's story, strangely enough, in the letter of Archbishop Abbot to Sir Thomas Roe, which is introduced in a note to the discourse. A perusal of that letter, if it does not help the reviewer, will, at least, inform us what one of the most familiar of Calvert's contemporaries thought of his (Calvert's) religion, and how doubtful he considered it; it will show, also, what grounds Wood had for speaking with such uncertainty on the same point. Abbot shared with Calvert the intimacy of the king; had often sat in council with him; knew him, perhaps, as well as one courtier could know another. His letter, from the incident to which it refers, we may conclude was written in 1625. "Mr. Secretary Calvert hath never looked merrily since the prince's coming out of Spain: it was thought he was much interested in the Spanish affairs. A course was taken to rid him of all employments and negotiations. This made him discontented, and, as the saying is, 'Desperatio facit monachum,' so he apparently did turn papist, which he now professeth, *this being the third time he hath been to blame that way.* His majesty, to dismiss him, suffered him to resign his secretary's place to Sir Albertus Morton, who paid him £3,000 for the same, and the king hath made him baron of Baltimore in Ireland. So he is withdrawn from us, and having bought a ship of four hundred tons, he is going to New England, or Newfoundland, where he hath a colony."

This letter presents a portrait, which can not be mistaken, of a secretary surrounded by enemies who are envious of his favor with the king, and who feed their grudge against him by assailing him on the score of his religion. It shows him privately attached to a proscribed faith, which he was conscious might, at any moment, bring him into peril, and which, though not wholly concealed, was not publicly avowed until the avowal was compelled by the increasing intolerance of the times. It also indicates the sympathy and respect of the king and his desire to mitigate the severity of that party hostility which he could not entirely avert.

It argues a stout heart in the critic to challenge this letter as a confirmation of Fuller. Fuller tells us that Calvert, having become a Roman Catholic, resigned his post as incompatible with that profession. The archbishop says: a course was taken to rid him of all employments, and in order to dismiss him the king allowed him to sell out his commission, and, thereupon, he apparently again became a Catholic. But what does the reviewer say to—"this is the *third time* he hath been to blame in that way?" In what way? We have here his answer made with a most perplexed gravity. "This is a sneering innuendo to which converts are accustomed, but very different *from saying this is the third time he had become a Catholic.*" Certainly; the difference is very clear; it is as broad as a church door! But, says the reviewer, this does not prove that Calvert was a Catholic in 1619. Well, I confess I can not say that it does. I surrender that point, and

leave the reviewer to enjoy the vantage ground it gives him.

Let us look at his next essay to fortify "the unquestioned history of two centuries."

This he rests upon a fact furnished in a note to the Discourse relating to the estate in Longford.

By patent, February 18, 1621, the king conferred upon Calvert somewhat over two thousand acres of land in the county of Longford in Ireland, regarding him, as my authority says, "as a person worthy of his royal bounty, and one that would plant and build the same according to his late instructions for the better furtherance and strengthening of said plantation." This patent Calvert surrendered to the king, February 12, 1625, four days before he was created Lord Baltimore, and had a regrant thereof in fee simple, dated March 11, in the same year.

The reviewer has favored us with a scrap of history touching this grant. There were nearly six entire counties in Ulster confiscated to the crown upon the pretext of Tyrone's rebellion. These lands were granted anew to favorites, upon certain conditions of plantation, the principal scope of which was to secure as many English and Scotch settlers as possible, and to exclude all tenants who would not take the oaths of allegiance and supremacy.

This confiscation was a mere act of rapine and violence. It was dictated by religious hatred, and its object was to strip or spoil the Catholic landlords and tenants of that region.

Some years afterwards a still more wicked, because an entirely unprovoked act of aggression, was perpetrated upon the Catholic proprietors of Longford and some other counties. There was no rebellion on this occasion, either pretended or real, on foot to afford an excuse or apparent justification for this last outrage; but upon the flimsiest of all pretensions—an alleged defect in the titles of those in possession—the king granted out those lands also to his friends. Whether the conditions of plantation in Longford were the same as those published some years before in reference to Ulster, I am unable positively to say, although the reviewer asserts they were. I have reason to suppose they were not. This, however, is not material. Now the argument is that Calvert, if he had been a Catholic in 1621, could not have accepted such a grant, and, moreover, that he surrendered the lands in February, 1625, because he was then become a Catholic, and could not conscientiously hold them on the conditions required. But, then, here is another fact, that, although he surrendered the grant in February, it was to *take an absolute gift of the same lands in fee*, which he did on the 11th of March following. The reviewer's reasoning on this point is worthy of remark. "His claims," he says, "upon the monarch's gratitude were greater than when he had first received the grant, and it would have been an act of meanness in the king to permit his faithful minister to lose the benefit of his former bounty, which, probably, had thus far been a cause of expenditure rather than a source of profit. His surrender placed it again in the hands of the king, because he could not hold it by its former conditions; *but there was no impediment to his receiving an unconditional title in fee simple.*"

This is a choice exhibition of the reviewer's notions of a man of delicate religious scruples. Calvert's conscience would not allow him to retain a grant which bound him to no severer condition than that of conforming to the wish of his patron, the donor, by selecting his under tenants from English or Scotch settlers who could take the oaths of supremacy and allegiance; but he could find conscience enough to take to himself in fee simple and in absolute right, for his own enjoyment, land which had been plundered by acts of unparalleled fraud and rapine from the persecuted, hunted and despoiled brethren of his own faith! The wickedness of this scheme of plantation was not in the selection of persons who could be

induced to resettle the land, but in the iniquitous spoliation of those from whom it was taken. If, therefore, Calvert had any religious scruple on the subject, it would have shown itself in refusing to be made an accessory, an aider and abettor of the vile scheme of plunder by which the original proprietors were dispossessed. He would neither have stained his hand nor tainted his soul by any fellowship in the outrage. He would have left that miserable part to some meaner nature who was capable of being lured by the profits of such a compliance.

Calvert's participation in it, therefore, rather leads me to adopt the opinion which many unprejudiced English and Irish writers both have given us; namely, that the Irish plantations, during the reign of James, were not all conceived or executed in such a spirit of unmitigated injustice as a cursory review of the fact might lead us to suppose: that there were favorable exceptions to this character, and that, mixed up with much evil and oppression, they were not unfrequently conducted with evident good policy. James could make what relaxations he pleased in these regulations of settlement; and we may well suppose he would not be disinclined to exercise this prerogative in such a manner as might suit the wishes of a favorite servant, by so adjusting the terms of the grant as to render it acceptable to the object of his bounty, and enable him to receive it without violating his sense of right. The surrender in 1625 was obviously a mere preliminary to that greater exhibition of the royal favor which, in elevating Calvert to the peerage, designed also to confer upon him something more than an empty title, and which accordingly invested him with the absolute grant of a baronial estate. Calvert was created Lord Baltimore on the 16th of Feb., 1625. In less than a month afterward his estates in Ireland were enlarged under the new grants of the manor of Baltimore and that of Ulford. These grants were perfected on the 11th of March, just a fortnight before the death of the king. They may be regarded almost in the light of a bequest from the monarch to a trusty but somewhat proscribed servant.

The reviewer makes still one more attempt to sustain the narrative of Fuller. This I believe is his last struggle in that enterprise. He thus presents his argument:

"Additional evidence that Calvert was not a Catholic in 1620 is found in the period of his parliamentary career. He was elected a member of the house of commons in 1620. At that period even, if, as a Catholic, he had been eligible to a seat in the house of commons, it is not to be imagined that an Oxford or a York constituency would have elected a member of that persuasion as their representative, or that in the then state of popular excitement they would have chosen a member who was suspected of being 'popishly affected.' Now his parliamentary services terminated in 1624, the time of his conversion, as stated, and thus this fact may be invoked, as well as the testimony of Wood and Abbot, to confirm the veracity of Fuller."

We have no means of knowing what were the sentiments or the spirit of compliance of those whom the reviewer calls an Oxford or a York constituency at that day; but we may make a great mistake if we suppose that constituencies, in our modern notion of them, had much to do, in the time of James, with popular sentiment of any kind. Occasionally there was some little outbreak of popular opinion which might be turned to the account of free election,—and I shall presently produce an instance of it,—but the returns to parliament were much more generally obtained by court favor. The doubt expressed by the reviewer, as to the *eligibility* of a Catholic, is answered by the well known fact that there were several Catholics in the very parliament of which Calvert was a member: *concealed Catholics*, according to the phrase of that period, but not the less on that account, perhaps, sincere in their faith. We have the best

reason to believe that Calvert was one of them.

The people of England had not much acquaintance with parliament in those days, and, we may suppose, took no great interest in elections. The second parliament in the reign of James was summoned on the 5th of April, 1614, and was dissolved on the 9th of June in the same year, without having passed a single act.

The next parliament was that of which Calvert was a member from Yorkshire. It met on the 30th of January, 1621, after an interval of nearly seven years. In what manner this parliament was got up may be seen in the lord chancellor's (Bacon's) letter to Buckingham, describing the means that had been adopted by the king and his ministers to render the meeting safe and profitable to the king. "Yesterday," says he, "I called unto us the two chief justices and Sergeant Crew, about the parliament business. To call more judges I thought not good. It would be little to assistance, much to secrecy. The distribution of the business we made was into four parts." The third matter in the arrangement relates, in the chancellor's language, to "what persons were fit to be of the house, tending to make a sufficient and well composed house of the ablest men of the kingdom, fit to be advised with, *circa ardua regni*, as the style of the writs goeth, according to the pure and true institution of a parliament, and of the means to place such persons without novelty or much observation. *For this purpose we made some lists of names of the prime counsellors and principal statesmen and courtiers;* of the gravest and wisest lawyers; of the most respected and best tempered knights and gentlemen of the country. And here, *obiter*, we did not forget to consider who were the *boutfeus* of the last session, how many of them are dead, how many reduced, and how many remain, and what were fit to be done concerning them."

This, assuredly, is a pretty good recipe for making a parliament! We need scarcely, after reading this letter, pursue the investigation how it could happen that the king's secretary of state should find a seat in the house, or whether the constituency of Yorkshire were very accurately represented in either their opinions or their prejudices. This parliament met January 30th, 1621; took a recess from March 27th to April 18th, and adjourned June 4th; met again towards the last of November, and sat about a month, and then was dissolved. The next parliament was summoned on the 19th of February, 1624; was prorogued May 29th of that year, and never met again. The court favor which brought Calvert into the preceding parliament from Yorkshire, failed him on this occasion. Sir John Savile, a leader of the country party, opposed him, and overthrew him by a decided majority, notwithstanding the aid of Wentworth, afterwards the earl of Strafford, and the influence of the king. This is the outbreak of popular opinion to which I have referred above, and which was sufficiently powerful to defeat the wishes of the king. The consequences of this defeat were, first, the return of Calvert to parliament from Oxford, which was found more pliable to the royal will than Yorkshire; and second, the promotion of Sir John Savile to the privy council, the office of comptroller of the household, and finally to the peerage, which took off the edge of Sir John's opposition, and brought him into a temper of very convenient assentation. This is said to be the first example in English history of that species of corruption which has since been found so serviceable to the crown.

From this little history of Calvert's parliamentary career, which altogether did not exceed six months of actual service, there can be no doubt that he was indebted for it exclusively to the influence of the king, and in that view we may find no difficulty in believing that his religious opinions had really no significance whatever in the question of his election. There

is, indeed, a letter from Wentworth to Calvert, written during the contest with Sir John Savile, and published in the Strafford papers, which plainly indicates to the secretary the interest which the privy council takes in his success, and the probability of their interference in his behalf. He writes from Yorkshire: "I find the gentlemen of these parts generally ready to do you service. Sir Thomas Fairfax stirs not, but Sir John Savile, by his instruments, exceeding busy, intimating to the common sort, underhand, that yourself, being not resiant in the county, can not by law be chosen; and being his majesty's secretary and a stranger, one not safe to be trusted by the county. . . . . I have heard that when Sir Francis Darcy opposed Sir Thomas Lake in a matter of like nature, the lords of the council writ to Sir Francis to desist. I know my lord chancellor is very sensible of you in this business; a *word to him, and such a letter would make an end of all.*" Oxford, however, was found to be a more sure card, and the secretary obtained the return from that quarter in time to take a seat in the next parliament.

I have now disposed of Fuller's testimony, and of those auxiliary facts to which the reviewer has resorted for confirmation of it. This is the whole evidence in favor of the conversion: I mean all the evidence that is pretended to be original or authentic. The repetitions of Fuller's statement, by subsequent biographers or historians, such as those of Lloyd, Kippis, Collier, Belknap, and others of the succeeding century, can not be regarded as giving it any new character. Lloyd, the author of "The Worthies of State," who published his book a few years after Fuller's work appeared, is a compilation of mere plagiarisms. It copies nearly the whole of Fuller's account verbatim, without acknowledging the theft, and manifestly steals from some other unacknowledged source a few passages of commendation of Calvert, which seem to have been written by some author almost on purpose to show that the secretary was a Catholic during the time he was in office. "Two things," he remarks, "are eminent in this man. First; that, though he was a Catholic, yet kept he himself sincere and disengaged from all interests, and though a man of great judgment, yet not obstinate in his sentiments; but taking as great pleasure in hearing others' opinions as in delivering his own, which he heard moderated and censured with more patience than applauded. Second, that he carried a digested and exact account of affairs to his master every night, and took to himself the pains to examine the letters which related to any interest that might be any ways considerable. *He was the only statesman that being engaged to a decried party, yet managed his business with that huge respect for all sides, that all who knew him applauded him, and none that had any thing to do with him complained of him.*"

I repeat that I have no knowledge from whom Lloyd borrowed this sketch, but it is very plain that the writer of it did not mean to describe Calvert as a Catholic only after he had abandoned public life. The whole scope of the language is to show that the secretary, although a Catholic, whilst in the management of the public affairs, gave satisfaction to all by his prudence and moderation. I may observe also that Kippis, Collier, and Belknap have incorporated this brief sketch of Calvert into their biographies.

The question of Calvert's religion—I mean whether he were a converted Catholic or an original one, or, if converted, whether at an earlier or later period of his life—has never been one of much significance to the older writers who have had occasion to speak of him. Their attention has been but little given to this point. Bozman is the only one who has really discussed it with any degree of particularity, and his conclusion is in accordance with my Discourse: "It is not probable, therefore, that the principles of the Catholic religion were newly adopted by him

in 1624."* All others have either passed it by, or treated it as a matter of small consequence. Hence the incongruity and carelessness of some of the statements, and the obscurity of others. This topic has only become conspicuous in tracts upon the life of Lord Baltimore within a few years past. It seems of late to have fired the imagination of some zealous panegyrists as a theme of peculiar capabilities, and he has accordingly been portrayed, with affectionate fervor, in the lineaments of a religious hero; they have invested him with some portion of that saintly grandeur which gives such lustre to the achievements of a champion of the cross. Captivated with this fancy, they have lavished no small amount of exaggeration on the pictures they have drawn of the progress of his conversion, his devotion, his studies, his sacrifices, and his self-immolating heroism.

The foundation for all this warmth of description is simply the short paragraph I have quoted from Fuller. It is not pretended that any writer has communicated more than Fuller, and even of those who copy from him, few have said as much. It has been reserved for our own time to translate his humble prose into ambitious and eloquent poetry, and for grave reviewers to abet this falsification of history even to the extent of quarrelling with all who can not warm their faith up to that red heat which disables the mental vision from discriminating between hyperbole and simple truth. "Buffeted," says an orator of this new school, whose oration is republished with special commendation in the April number of the Catholic Magazine in 1842, "and tossed in the storms of controversy, he (Calvert) found a secure haven in the bosom of the Catholic church. Soon as conviction converted doubt into certainty, he resigned his office, ceasing to be the servant of his king in order to become the servant of his God. He discarded the emoluments of earth for the rewards of heaven, and exchanged the bright hopes of the present for the unfading certainties of the future. He openly avowed his recantation, professed his conversion, and became a genuine worshipper at the shrine of truth."

This idea has been expanded since, on anniversary and other occasions, in still more glowing colors, until, at last, it has become one of the reviewer's *unquestionable facts* of history.

In what "storms of controversy" Calvert was tossed—he "who kept himself disengaged from all interests," and took "as great pleasure in hearing others' opinions as in delivering his own,"—we shall vainly seek to learn from any accessible record of the past. How "he discarded the emoluments of earth for the rewards of heaven" might fall under rather a singular illustration in the record which tells us of his forced resignation, his sale of his commission, his Irish patent for the manors of Baltimore and Ulford, his acceptance of the peerage, and the grant to him of what, in his day, was regarded as the *principality* of Maryland. How, "in ceasing to be the servant of his king, he became the servant of his God"—in what respect he was less entitled to the latter character before his resignation than after it—would involve us in an equally inconclusive search.

I can not write the history of Calvert in this key. With such facts as I have before me, how can I gratify the demands of the reviewer with such fancies as he has before him? I wish the truth had given me the advantage of these eloquent themes. If Maryland had been founded by St. Francis Xavier himself, or Calvert could have laid claim to his virtues, I assure the editors of the Catholic Magazine it would have offended no prejudice of mine. I should rejoice to do the subject all the justice its warmest friends could desire. But, I repeat, I can not write the history of Lord Baltimore to this key note. Without meaning any thing disrespectful to those who have

*See vol. i, Hist. of Md. pp. 245—248, where this subject is examined somewhat at large.

done so, I must say that these exaggerations are but the offspring of fancy, the foam of anniversary eulogies, of premeditated and predetermined panegyric. The representation of Calvert as a *religious* hero is a pure fiction; it has not a single authority to sustain it.

I come now to the evidence on my side of this question; and here I beg leave to recall the issue between the reviewer and myself. I had said: "Upon the question of the supposed conversion of Calvert there seems to be room for great doubt. I do not believe in it at all. I think there is proof extant to show that he had always been attached to the church of Rome, or at least from an early period of his life."

The reviewer, quoting these words from my Discourse, makes this comment upon the author and his mode of treating the subject:

"The process of reasoning by which he endeavors to prove his negative is very remarkable. He has employed more industry in the attempt to subvert *this simple historical fact* (the conversion), than on any portion of his Discourse. Detached scraps of history, questionable dates, the sneers of political and religious opponents, are all marshalled to assist his hypothesis, without allowing to the affirmative of the question the least support from the *clear* and *indisputable records* of the time."

I have already shown what "this simple historical fact" rests upon, and I have examined what the reviewer calls "the clear and indisputable records." What "the detached scraps of history" are worth, and what are "the questionable dates," will be seen presently.

I argued the inaccuracy of Fuller, first, from the character itself of the statement he had made; and, secondly, from known facts which were incompatible with it. I shall now recapitulate these facts, and add some others to which I had not access when I wrote the Discourse.

1. All the children of Lord Baltimore, of whom we know any thing, were Roman Catholics. We must suppose, therefore, in accordance with the reviewer's theory of the conversion, that these were nurtured and educated in the Protestant faith, and that they all became as suddenly converted as the parent. The reviewer passes by this suggestion in total silence. Cecil, the eldest, was, in 1624, eighteen years of age. Leonard and George we may suppose to have been old enough to have some fixed opinions upon their own religion; and so of the others still younger. When we reflect upon the bitterness of religious prejudice in that day, and how naturally it would be fostered in the schools; what disabilities, privations, and persecution followed conversion, and what rewards and inducements were offered to those who refused to change their creed, surely this argument had weight enough to entitle it to the reviewer's notice, if he could answer it. We are, however, I suppose, to consider it as disposed of under the class of "vague surmises," "erroneous inferences," and "questionable dates," where I am quite willing to leave it to be weighed by all candid readers of the review.

2. I gave the direct testimony of contemporaneous writers and historians.

Abbot, the archbishop of Canterbury, was a contemporary. His letter to Sir Thomas Roe I have already exhibited. That he was an enemy to Calvert, I have stated; that is apparent in the letter. But still this letter, which was a private communication to a friend, is conclusive—not as to the motives it imputes to Calvert, but to the fact that Calvert was considered, by those who were familiar with his career, as one of doubtful religious opinions, who had previously been known in the character of a Catholic—that he was not then *converted* to that faith. The language of the letter rather imports that he, for the third time, turned Catholic when the prince returned from Spain, which was in October, 1623, and that he *now*—at the date of the letter, and after his resignation—openly professes

that religion. It was more than a year after the prince's return that Calvert resigned. This letter was introduced into a note accompanying the Discourse, as a fact which tended to corroborate other testimony. I might with propriety have insisted upon a higher character for it. The language I used on presenting it was: "My view of Calvert's private adhesion to the church of Rome, at a date so much earlier than is ascribed to him by Fuller, is *greatly strengthened* by the following extract:" The reviewer considers it "a very unlawyerlike way" of turning aside "from the *positive* testimony of Fuller" to substitute "*circumstantial* evidence to prove the negative." Every one will perceive that Abbot's testimony is quite positive, and is that of an eye-witness. Fuller's is, at best, but hearsay; and if the "lawyerlike way" is to guide our investigation, his account would not be received in court at all.

3. I have shown in the Discourse, by extracts from King James' speeches, his strong hatred of those who changed from the Protestant to the Catholic faith, and how different was his feeling towards those Catholics who were not converts. It offended his vanity as a learned divine, which character he affected during his whole reign with abundant pedantry. The extracts I produced were from speeches in 1609 and in 1616. I have since been able to add that further confirmation of this trait in his character, which I have quoted some pages back, upon the testimony of Tillieres, the French embassador, in 1622, and in reference to a case of close resemblance to that which the reviewer imputes to Calvert. It is merely absurd to attempt to evade this argument by railing at the weakness of James' character. Weak it was, without doubt, and contemptible enough; but those who study his reign will find that his weakness was quite as much demonstrated by the obstinacy of his prejudices as by any other vice of his character. "Theology," says Lingard, "he considered as the first of sciences, on account of its object, and of the highest importance to himself, in quality of head of the church and defender of the faith. . . . . To the last he employed himself in theological pursuits; and to revise works of religious institution, to give directions to preachers, and to confute the heresies of foreign divines, were objects which occupied the attention and divided the cares of the sovereign of three kingdoms." It is not difficult, in view of this character of him, to appreciate the force of Tillieres' remark concerning the change of religion of the countess of Buckingham, that the marquess, her son, knew "that if any thing upon earth could undermine *his* favor, or give it a shock, this very accident is of that description."

4. I have referred to the fact mentioned by Rapin, that Gondomar was said, in 1620, to endeavor to corrupt the court with a view to the Spanish match, and that the historian enumerates Sir George Calvert, with the earl of Arundel, Weston and others, as persons "popishly affected," upon whom, it was charged, that the Spanish embassador, at that date, attempted to practise. This the reviewer seeks to elude, by telling us that "this term was used by one political party to designate the other party who were endeavoring to bring about the marriage of the prince of Wales to the infanta of Spain," that it was "precisely as the most violent members of one of our two former political parties characterized the democrats as under French influence, and the federalists as British tories."

I will not stop to dispute this point with the critic. Probably enough the parties often used such phrases in a merely calumnious temper. I have, however, in reference to this case, materials at hand to show exactly what the historian meant when he said Calvert in 1620 was "popishly affected." And even the reviewer's own explanation would show that the secretary, at this time, was acting with the Catholic party. Early in 1624—March or April—the two houses of parliament

presented a petition to the king, praying, amongst other things, "that all papists should be removed from London and the court, and discharged from all offices of trust." "The king," says Rapin, "had artfully avoided to answer the two principal articles of the petition. Had he consented to these two requests, the face of the court would have been entirely changed. The duke of Buckingham's mother, who, by her son's means, disposed of all offices, must have been removed. His duchess, also, would have been of this number, *as well as one of the secretaries of state,* with many others who had considerable places at court and in the country."*

The only secretaries of state were Sir George Calvert and Sir Edward Conway. The latter had been joined with Sir Richard Weston, in 1620, in the embassy to Bohemia, and is described by Rapin, in the notice of that embassy, *as a Protestant,* which I find to be asserted also by other historians. Bozman, who adverts to this same passage in Rapin to show that Calvert was not a convert in 1624, takes notice of the fact that Rapin subsequently speaks of Conway as a Catholic. That this is the effect of inadvertence in the historian of England is evident, not only from its contradiction of his first account of Conway, but also from its being at variance with the statement of Wilson, upon whose authority he wrote. That author says, in his history of the reign of James, in speaking of the negotiation in Bohemia, and of the two embassadors: "These two were suited for the employment, happily, *upon design.* Weston being a kind of papist, and Conway a Protestant, the better to close up the breach between the emperor (who was a Catholic) and the king of Bohemia" (who was a Protestant).

There can be no doubt, therefore, that Rapin's allusion, in the passage above quoted, is to Calvert. It is worth remarking that at this time Calvert was himself in parliament, a member from Oxford.

That Rapin was correct in his reference to Calvert's religion will appear conclusively in the next evidence I am able to produce.

5. Arthur Wilson is the most authentic contemporary historian we have of the reign of James—one who is more frequently quoted than any other. He was attached to the family of the earl of Essex, who was a conspicuous actor in the affairs of that reign, and under whose inspection the history of James was written. Although a prejudiced and somewhat inflated writer, Wilson's narrative of facts has been greatly relied on by the principal historians who have had occasion to treat of the same period. His testimony to the religion of Calvert is very positive and direct, as will be seen from the following extracts.

Speaking of the original appointment of Calvert as secretary of state, he says:

"Time and age had also worn out Sir Ralph Winwood, the king's able, faithful, and honest servant and secretary; who dying, Sir Robert Naunton, and Sir George Calvert were made secretaries; men of contrary religions and factions (as they were then styled), Calvert being an Hispaniolized papist; the king matching them together, like contrary elements, to find a medium betwixt them."*

Again, referring to an event of 1621, he uses this language:

"The king, hearing that the house were hammering upon this remonstrance, went to Newmarket, ... and as the business grew up, he had intimation of it from his creatures in the house, for it vexed his popish secretary, Sir George Calvert, Weston, and others, to find the house so bitter against their profession."†

These extracts leave no doubt as to the meaning of the writer. Before I dismiss the evidence derived from contemporary sources of information, it may be well to mention that Calvert is said by Wood to

* Rapin, vol. ii, p. 230, folio edition.

* Wilson in Kennet. p. 705. † Ib. 740.

have written a tract entitled, "The Answer of Thomas Tell Troth." This answer is not, so far as I am aware, now extant; but the pamphlet of Thomas Tell Troth, to which, I infer, Calvert's was an answer, is preserved. It was a severe attack upon the king for the countenance given by him to Catholics, and particularly recommended to his care and protection the Protestants in France. It was published in 1621. If Calvert wrote the answer to it, such an enterprise would seem to give still further confirmation to the facts I have already adduced to show his religious tendencies. To this surmise, however, I acknowledge that, in the vague state of our information, but little importance is to be attached. I throw it out rather as a question for research than an item of proof.

I am now brought to a second era in my investigation. This leads us into the inquiry—what is the received historical opinion of Calvert's religion amongst historians of later date than his contemporaries?

Connected with this inquiry, I have to notice the following remarkable passage in the review:

"One of the most extraordinary of the attacks on Fuller's veracity is that founded on the *supposed* date of Calvert's charter for Avalon. The zeal with which the orator elaborates his argument upon this topic, requires more time to analyze his quotations and exhibit how utterly fallacious are his conclusions than under any other circumstances would be bestowed on them."

To say nothing of the bad English and bad grammar of this passage,—and interpreting it to mean, that my zeal in elaborating my argument has *put the reviewer under the necessity of employing* more time to analyze the quotations,—I have to remark that the only thing that may be considered "extraordinary" in the attack on Fuller's veracity "*founded on the supposed date of Calvert's charter for Avalon,*" is that there is no trace of such an attack to be found in the Discourse. The analysis, therefore, of that attack would require a good deal of time as well as of ingenuity. The reviewer has consequently spared neither. His principal difficulty is to *find* the attack: the importance of his finding it I shall notice in the sequel. In his search after this desideratum he favors his readers with the following extract from the Discourse: "Now Calvert settled his colony in Newfoundland in 1621, and Oldmixon and others, amongst whom I find our own historian, Bozman, have ascribed this settlement to his wish to provide an asylum for persecuted Catholics. Although I can not discover any warrant for this statement, either in the history of the times or in what is known of Calvert, yet the assertion of it by Oldmixon and those who have preceded or followed him, demonstrates that they did not credit the story of the conversion as given by Fuller: for the author of the Worthies of England dates the conversion three years later than the settlement of Avalon, and affirms it to be the motive of Calvert's resignation of a high trust which, he informs us, the secretary supposed he could not conscientiously hold as a Catholic."

In this extract, the reader will remark, there is not a syllable about the "supposed date of the Avalon charter." Upon this quotation the reviewer makes the following comment: "Now the inference that Oldmixon discredits Fuller is *entirely unauthorized*, as are, also, the deductions from the date of the *settlement*, 1621, as *being the date of the charter.* The orator was not aware that Calvert had made a settlement in Newfoundland *before* he obtained a charter for Avalon, and, therefore, he has himself fallen into the error of confounding the settlement of Capt. Wynne in 1621, *when Sir George Calvert was secretary of state and a Protestant*, with the endeavor to find an asylum for the practice of his religion in 1626, and later, when he had become a Catholic. But while the orator quotes Bozman's authority, he has no right to assume 1621 *as the date of the charter.* Oldmixon does not

profess to give the date of the charter. But Bozman furnishes the highest testimony that has been produced to show that the date of the charter of Avalon was 1623."

The reviewer then affirms that Oldmixon, so far from contradicting Fuller, *confirms his statement.* Then he gives us a particular account of Sir George Calvert's first connection with Newfoundland, the interest he obtained from Vaughan, his sending Capt. Wynne there in 1621, and his own subsequent removal—all of which he has collected, as I shall have occasion to show presently, from Oldmixon and other writers. And upon the strength of the whole narrative, he winds up with this conclusion: "Having shown the fallacy of the orator's statement that Avalon was *chartered and settled* in 1621, all his arguments founded *upon that hypothesis,* asserting that Calvert was a Catholic in 1619, and imputing to him oaths which, as such, he could not conscientiously take, must fall. The orator's whole assumption in regard *to the date* of the Avalon *charter* and *settlement* is unauthorized, and the authorities he refers to contradict his statements."

Doubtless the reader of the review, after this pertinacious reiteration—no less than four times made in this extract—believes that I have, some where in the Discourse, confounded the *settlement in* 1621 with the *date of the charter;* doubtless he will believe, also, that I was not aware "that Calvert had made a settlement in Newfoundland *before* he obtained a charter for Avalon." This is so emphatically and importunately repeated, that it is quite evident the reviewer considers his exposure of "the fallacy" as one of his great points. The positive tone of these assertions in the review will suggest a curious problem as to the writer's state of mind, when the following passage from the Discourse is read:

"The *settlement* in Newfoundland, alluded to in this extract," (an extract from Fuller, which had just been given,) "was made in 1621, in which year, according to the account of Oldmixon, in his British Empire in America, Sir George Calvert sent Capt. Wynne thither with a small colony. In 1622 Capt. Wynne was reinforced with an additional number of Colonists. The *charter or grant,* however, for this plantation, it is said, upon some doubtful, or rather obscure testimony, bears date of the twenty-first year of the king, *which would assign it to the year* 1623. After the death of James, which was in the year 1625, Lord Baltimore went twice to Avalon."*

Could language be more explicit to show that I was aware of the settlement in 1621, *before* the date of the charter? Have I fallen into "the fallacy" of stating "that Avalon was *chartered* and *settled* in 1621?"

In this little feat of mystification the reviewer has attempted to escape my argument. I said that Oldmixon and other writers have asserted that Calvert made the settlement in Newfoundland *as a Roman Catholic,* and that that settlement was begun in 1621. The reviewer replies that Oldmixon and the others say only that he was a Catholic when he went *himself* to Newfoundland, which was after 1625, and that I have confounded the *settlement* with the *date of the charter,* and have misrepresented the historians who, in speaking of Calvert's religion, refer it to the latter period, when he went to Newfoundland, and not to the former, when he sent Capt. Wynne there. The reviewer, indeed, asserts in round terms that, at the date of Capt. Wynne's settlement in 1621, Calvert *was a Protestant;* and as he makes this assertion in connection with his reference to Oldmixon, he means to have it understood that that writer sustains this view. His words are: "Oldmixon does not contradict Fuller, *but, in fact, confirms his statement.*"

This brings us to a very direct issue of fact. Does Oldmixon confirm Fuller? Does he not confirm my statement of

* Discourse, p. 18.

Calvert's religion? I shall show now, not only that I fairly stated the fact from Oldmixon, but also that the reviewer, having Oldmixon and other writers before him, could not have perused them without finding the most complete evidence of the correctness of my statement. I can scarcely conceive that any supposed degree of carelessness in the reviewer can exculpate his candor in failing to exhibit the testimony of these authorities, and to confess their weight in this question. He has referred, in the course of his review, to several authors; he has manifestly read them — carefully, we should think — in reference to the very subject upon which we are at issue. These works are Oldmixon's British Empire in America, the Modern Universal History, Wynne's History of America, Douglass' Summary, and Bozman's Maryland. I believe these are all he has quoted in the review, which speak of the settlement of Newfoundland.

I have all these works now at hand, and it is my purpose to extract from them a few particulars in regard to this settlement, which I commend to the reviewer's notice. They will be found to throw a sharp light upon "the simple historical fact" that "has been unquestioned for two centuries."

1. The oldest of these works is Oldmixon's. It was published in 1708. He gives us this account, vol. i, p. 4:

"Dr. William Vaughan of Caermathenshire purchased a grant from the patentees for part of the country (Newfoundland) to make a settlement, which, however, he never effected. In 1616, Capt. Whitburn was taken in his way from Newfoundland to Lisbon, with a cargo of fish, and, in the year 1618, he went thither as Dr. Vaughan's deputy; though whom he was to govern we don't find mentioned any where by himself or other writers, or that there was any settlement of English till two or three years after," (bringing it to 1620-21,) "when Sir George Calvert, principal secretary of state to King James, got a grant of the best part of the island. This gentleman, *being of the Romish religion*, was uneasy at home, and had the same reason to leave the kingdom as those gentlemen had who went to New England, to enjoy the liberty of his conscience: *he, therefore, resolved to retire to America*, and finding the Newfoundland company made no use of their grant, *he thought of this place for his retreat;* to which end he procured a patent for that part of the island that lies between the Bay of Bulls in the east, and Cape St. Mary in the south, which was erected into a province and called Avalon..... Sir George, afterwards Lord Baltimore, sent over persons to plant *and prepare things for his reception;* and, in 1621, Capt. Wynne went thither with a small colony, at Sir George's charge, who seated himself at Ferryland."

Here we have in this narrative Sir George Calvert, secretary of state, a Roman Catholic, uneasy at home, resolving to retire to America, and *thinking of Newfoundland* as a place of retreat; his attention directed to this spot because the Newfoundland company made no use of their grant. Of course all this is previous to his making any settlement. Then he is described as getting a patent for a plantation there. We are then told that Sir George, who was afterwards Lord Baltimore, sent Capt. Wynne over, in 1621, to prepare things for his reception. In vol. iv of Purchas' Pilgrims, p. 1882–1891, we have Whitburn's account of this settlement in 1621, and a reference to some of Capt. Wynne's letters to Sir George, the first of which is dated in that year.

Now I ask, does not this narrative most distinctly affirm that Sir George Calvert was a Roman Catholic before he sent Capt. Wynne to Newfoundland? Does this fact confirm, or does it contradict Fuller?

2. Douglass is the next writer in point of date, having published his first edition of the Summary in 1739. His notice of Calvert is too brief, confused, and desultory to be quoted. It merely speaks of

him as a Roman Catholic, without the slightest insinuation that he was ever any thing else.

3. The Modern Universal History, published in 1763, gives us the following narrative: vol. xxxix, p. 249.

"Next year Dr. Vaughan purchased a grant from the patentees of part of the country included in their patent; settled a little colony at Cambriol, in the southernmost part of the island, now called Little Britain, appointed Whitburn governor, but made no progress in extending colonies and clearing plantations. About the same time *Sir George Calvert, a Roman Catholic,* petitioned the king for a part of the island lying between the Bay of Bulls to the eastward and Cape St. Mary to the southward, *in order that he might enjoy that freedom of conscience in this retreat which was denied him in his own country.* . . . . . Before his departure from England, Sir George sent Capt. Edw'd Wynne with a small colony, to Newfoundland, *to prepare every thing necessary for his reception.* . . . . . The following year he was reinforced with a number of men, and supplied with stores and implements by Capt. Powel, and soon after he writes to his superior, Sir George Calvert, in the following terms"—(here is an extract given from a letter dated Aug. 17, 1622, as the same is found in Purchas.) . . . . . "A salt work was erected by Mr. Wynne, and brought to great perfection by Mr. Hickson, and so delighted was the proprietor, now Lord Baltimore, with the flourishing state of the colony, that he removed thither with his family."

In this rapid sketch of the settlement, we have, as before, Sir George Calvert *a Roman Catholic,* who petitions the king, which, of course, is previous to his settlement; sends Capt. Wynne thither to prepare for his reception; is afterwards created Lord Baltimore, and goes to the settlement himself.

4. Next we have Wynne's British Empire in America, published in 1776, and there we read as follows, vol. i, p. 44.

"The next year a little colony was founded at Cambriol, on the southern part of Newfoundland, of which the same Whitburn was appointed governor. Sir George Calvert, (in this edition it is misprinted Sir George *Vaughan,*) *a Roman Catholic,* also obtained the grant of that part of the coast lying between St. Mary's to the southward and the Bay of Bulls to the eastward, and the Puritans resorted thither. Capt. Edward Wynne arrived before Sir George, with a small colony at Newfoundland, to prepare every thing necessary for him. . . . . Lord Faulkland, lieutenant of Ireland, also sent a colony to Newfoundland; but at this time the proprietor, who was made Lord Baltimore, returned to England, where he got a grant of Maryland."

5. The last of the authorities to which we are referred is Bozman, who has written with more research, more particularity, and, in general, with more accuracy than any other historian of what relates to Maryland. In his first volume of the History of Maryland, p. 232, in noticing the events of 1621, he thus introduces Sir George Calvert:

"It was in this situation of things that Sir George Calvert, who was now one of the principal secretaries of state, and of the *Roman Catholic religion,* influenced probably by the recent example of the emigration of the Puritans to New England," (alluding to the notable emigration of 1620,) "*contemplated a settlement* of Catholics in Newfoundland."

This Roman Catholic gentleman, a secretary of state, influenced probably by the recent example of the Puritans, *contemplated* a settlement in Newfoundland. Of course, all this was before any grant was obtained, or colony sent out. A few pages afterwards—p. 241—Bozman continues his narration:

"Previous, however, to his own embarkation for the country granted to him, he thought it most proper to send a small colony thither under the command of a Capt. Edward Wynne, who seated him-

self and colonists at a place called Ferryland."

Bozman has fallen into some uncertainty in regard to the date of Wynne's first voyage, by supposing that it may have been in the year of the date of the charter, 1623. The reviewer seizes upon this doubt of Bozman's, imputes to *me* "the fallacy" of confounding the *settlement* by Wynne, and the date of the charter, and leaves us to infer that, at the date of the charter, Calvert was already a convert; that, in fact, the date of the charter was coincident with that of Fuller's story of the conversion. If Bozman had seen Wynne's letter from Newfoundland to Sir George, of the date of 1621, he could have had no difficulty on the subject. But even ascribing the settlement to 1623 furnishes no help to the reviewer, because Calvert served a year after that date as secretary of state, and was a member of parliament from Oxford in 1624, during which period, the reviewer affirms, he could not have been a Catholic. So that even if he had not sent Wynne out with the colony until 1623, when he obtained the charter of Avalon, being then a Roman Catholic, and having a purpose to make an asylum for persecuted Catholics, that fact alone would show that Fuller's story of the conversion in 1624 is incorrect. The testimony all concurs to indicate that he was a Catholic whilst he held the post of secretary of state and served as a member of parliament, and, consequently, that he did not resign on account of his conversion.

Could the reviewer be ignorant that Calvert was represented in these works as a *Roman Catholic*, when he made the settlement of Newfoundland? Was the reviewer ignorant that that settlement was made as early as 1621? And is not this my whole argument drawn from that incident in the history of Calvert? Is there any extraordinary zeal in the elaboration of this argument manifested in the Discourse? Is it not a simple historical fact, perspicuously set forth, and sustained by the best authorities to which I had access? Has the reviewer found the slightest expression, in a single historian, to contradict the fact that Calvert was a Roman Catholic when he sent Capt. Wynne to Newfoundland? Yet I am charged with taking "an advantage unworthy of my candor," when, in the presence of a large public auditory, I ventured to give the same account of Calvert's religion which I find in all the books I have consulted; and my enterprise is calumniated by the imputation of using that "opportunity to mystify our history, and to put forward *my* own conceits in opposition to all historians who have treated of the subject." I have no recriminations to make, but I would suggest a simple admonition to the reviewer, against allowing the rashness of his zeal, or the acerbity of his temper, to commit him again to the indiscretion of such an attack.

I have now concluded all I desire to say in reply to the principal point of the Discourse controverted in the review. The fact we have been discussing, every one will perceive, is one of predominant consideration in the true historical estimate of Calvert's character. I make no deductions, but leave it to every reader to form his own conclusions of the merit of the character which the whole survey of Calvert's life presents. I have very freely given my own opinion in my Discourse.

I have yet to notice a few minor points in the reviewer's assault upon me; and as I have already occupied more space in this reply than I proposed to myself, I will endeavor to be very brief with what remains. Indeed I should not deem these minor questions of sufficient importance for remark, were it not that where so much has been misunderstood, I have some reason to apprehend that my silence might furnish occasion for as much vituperation as, unluckily, has befallen me for what I have uttered.

The reviewer first assails the Discourse for the position assumed in it—that the

settlement of Maryland "did not owe its conception either to religious persecution or to that desire, which is supposed to have influenced other colonies, to form a society *dedicated to the promotion* of a particular worship." This is said to be "a negative and novel proposition" which is sought be established by "vague surmises and erroneous inferences, prejudicial to the character of Lord Baltimore and subversive of facts not only never disputed but adduced by most credible historians to sustain his high character."

Now all historians who have ever spoken of the settlement, I believe without a single exception, say that Lord Baltimore, being disappointed in his establishment in Newfoundland by reason of the rigor of the climate, the barrenness of the soil, and the exposure to attack, was, *therefore*, induced to look for a more favorable locality: that, with this object, he went to Virginia, and afterwards to Maryland. If this be true, how can it be said that the *conception* of the settlement in Maryland is to be attributed to religious persecution?

Nor was it to form a society dedicated to a particular worship. If there be any historian, credible or incredible, who affirms that it was, the reviewer ought to have favored us with his name. We have quotations in the review to show that Calvert went first to Virginia to settle: this fact is, indeed, not disputed by any one. Why did he go to Virginia if his object was to make a settlement dedicated to the promotion of a particular worship? Did not Lord Baltimore know that Virginia, at that day, would not tolerate such a settlement?

I do not deny that he contemplated, with satisfaction, the idea that, in Maryland, the persecuted Catholics would find an asylum. My denial is that that was not his *special* object in founding the colony. I believe that he contemplated an asylum for the persecuted of all Christian sects: that his purpose was, in the beginning, to make a liberal, tolerant government, without the slightest reference to sects; that the foundation of the province upon a particular religion was not in his view. I have said, notwithstanding all the authority upon the subject, I did not concur in believing that the settlement in Newfoundland, or in Maryland, was made with reference to a particular religious community. My argument was and is, that neither the charter, nor any thing that was done under it, indicates any such purpose. Calvert's invitation to emigrants, the earliest announcement of his plans, as they have been transmitted to us, show, in the most unequivocal terms, that his wish was to encourage emigration without reference to religious opinion. If there is extant a word from him or his successors which would imply that his design was to make a Catholic colony, I have not met with it. Yet, undoubtedly, if he had chosen, he had the power to confine his grants of land to Catholic settlers. It is in allusion to this that I took occasion to express, in *Rob of the Bowl*, that commendation of Lord Baltimore's liberality which the reviewer, with some notion that it contradicts what I have said in the Discourse, has quoted from vol. i, p. 52, of that work. I repeat now what I wrote then, in 1838, that Lord Baltimore "erected his government upon a basis of perfect religious freedom," and that "he did this at a time when he might have incorporated his own faith with the political character of the colony, and maintained it by a course of legislation which would, perhaps, even up to the present day, have rendered Maryland the chosen abode of those who now acknowledge the founder's creed." A very little circumspection in his conditions of plantation would, without the slightest violation of his charter, have filled the province chiefly with Catholics, and perhaps have secured their preponderance in the control of its affairs. He chose the more liberal and generous but, we have reason to believe, the more disastrous policy.

In this representation of Calvert I did not suppose I was derogating from his

fame, but, on the contrary, placing it upon the highest level with those statesmen who have won the praise due to the benefactors of mankind.

I have said also in another part of the Discourse that "the glory of Maryland toleration is in the charter, not in the act of 1649." This expression draws down upon me no small amount of the reviewer's displeasure. I can not follow him through all the mazes of his misappresion and consequent misrepresentation of my argument. It is very clear that he entirely mistakes the meaning of my remark. The fault may be mine in not speaking with sufficient perspicuity, although I supposed I had made myself intelligible when I said: "It was to the rare and happy coincidence of a wise, moderate, and energetic Catholic statesman, asking and receiving a charter from a Protestant monarch, jealous of the faith, but full of honorable confidence in the integrity of his servant, that we owe this luminous and beautiful exception of Maryland to the spirit of the colonization of the seventeenth century." I think a reader of the Discourse would not be at a loss to say that I had ascribed the toleration of Maryland to *the circumstances* connected with the grant of the charter, rather than to any specific provision in it. That the toleration was in the charter because it was a grant from a Protestant prince to a wise Catholic statesman. I argued to show that it was from this antagonism the liberal principle manifested in the establishment of the province was evolved. That a Catholic gentleman undertaking to administer a charter granted by a Protestant king, the result only could be religious toleration. The charter guarantied protection to the English church; it, therefore, bound a Catholic administrator of it to the greater circumspection as regards religious opinions. It gave him, amongst other things, the *exclusive* right to authorize the licensing and consecrating of chapels of the church of England. It gave him the whole patronage and right of presentation to benefices of that church. How was it possible that such grants as these could be followed up by religious intolerance on the part of the grantee? He was compelled by the charter to respect the rights of members of the Church of England: he could not, then, but respect the rights of all other Christians. That was my argument, and that was what I meant when I said "Maryland was the land of the sanctuary," that "all Christians were invited within its borders, and that there they found a written covenant of security against all encroachments on their rights of conscience by the lord proprietary and his government." This was the charter as framed by Lord Baltimore himself. Of what avail is it, in the argument of the reviewer, to reply that there was nothing in the laws of England, until the reign of Queen Anne, to prevent a Catholic from holding an advowson. The point of my argument was that Charles granted these privileges and powers to Calvert, and that that showed his confidence in the proprietary's moderation, liberality and toleration. I argued further that such grants as these from a Protestant prince to a Catholic proprietary raised a strong obligation of honor on the proprietary's side that he would not abuse that power by intolerance. Reverse the case, and what would the reviewer say if a Catholic monarch had given to a Protestant proprietary the exclusive right to license Catholic chapels, and the sole right to present to all benefices in the Catholic church? Would he not regard it as a proof of great confidence in the integrity, the impartiality, and in the liberality of the grantee? This is the sum of the argument in support of that toleration which I have deduced from the charter and its history.

I have one word more as to the political character of the charter. It contemplated a government in Maryland with a hereditary executive. It authorized the creation of an order of nobility. It empowered the proprietary to summon members to the legislature *by special writ*, without sub-

mitting the person so summoned to an election by the people; and, notwithstanding the reviewer's denial of this, nothing is more notorious in our history than the fact that members *were* so summoned. The cases may be seen, and the form of the writ may be read in Bozman.* It gave to the proprietary an absolute negative on all laws: it clothed him with power to make special ordinances without the sanction of the assembly: and the proprietary, also, as we are informed in the tract entitled "Virginia and Maryland," printed in London in 1655, exercised the power of dispensing with the laws. Upon a view of these and other features of the charter adverted to in the Discourse, I said: "We may affirm of it that, however beneficial it might be under the ministration of a liberal and wise proprietary, it contains many features which but little coincide with our notions of free or safe government." For the expression of such an opinion I am charged by the reviewer with detracting from Lord Baltimore's fame, and representing him as "a selfish and despotic statesman." Well; I have no mind to make points with him on this question. It is a matter of opinion. I have myself a strong repugnance to the doctrines of the high prerogative school. I have been educated to believe that in the popular privilege, as understood in English history, are to be found the true principles of free government. I do not blame any man for differing from me. It may be the result of education, temper, complexion of mind; and I freely accord to the reviewer the utmost sincerity in his partiality for the prerogative side. I have shown that Calvert, invested with all this power, had no disposition to abuse it; I still repeat, however, that such powers do not accord with the more generally received notions of the present time as to what constitutes free and safe government.

I forbear saying any thing, at present, on the subject of the act of 1649. That I propose to examine on some other occasion, when, I think, I shall be able to show that it was a constrained act, contrived as a measure to protect the lord proprietary and his friends at a very critical period; that it was the act of a Protestant legislature, with a Protestant governor at their head; and that it did not establish toleration in Maryland. I think I shall be able to show that the act itself, in many respects, is exceedingly intolerant, and is of such a character as the present day would not endure upon the statute book. But I will not bring it into this discussion.

I find that I have unwittingly fallen under censure for speaking in the Discourse of the "Romish" church. The reviewer does me no more than justice in supposing I would not use this phrase where it might be construed into disrespect. I was not aware that it had such an import. It is in constant use by the most liberal and impartial Protestant writers, and I have met it even in the works of Catholics. It is sufficient for me to say that I am too Catholic in all my feelings to apply a term of derision or reproach to any Christian sect; and I am sure I have afforded more than one proof to the Roman Catholics of Maryland, that, although differing from them in my faith, I cherish for them, and their connection with our history, all the respect due not only to their most sacred rights of conscience, but also to their noble efforts in times past, to secure to all others the same invaluable privileges. The term I have used, the reviewer remarks, is "quite innocent in itself," and, as he certainly had no reason to believe it was used otherwise than innocently by me, it was scarcely worthy, it strikes me, of so grave a comment as he has made upon it.

I have now fulfilled my design of answering the principal objections raised against my Discourse by the review.

In concluding, I take occasion to say that the critic has somewhat misapprehended the moral of my story—for it is mine—of the Student of Gottingen. If he

* Vol. ii, pp. 100, 101.

will examine it again he will find that the scholar was damned, not for writing in opposition "to the unquestioned history of two centuries," but for writing truths that were unwelcome to his readers. He will discover that the devil had the wit to see that he could set the world against the poor student who should be so bold as to write upon topics that did not flatter their self-love. I have no fear that this will be my case, for I can not doubt that the reviewer himself will be pleased to be rescued from a path of error even by my aid. If he shall persist, however, to walk in darkness, I hope he will show some sympathy for the hardship of the dilemma of one who, like myself, is placed between the hazards of offending men by the truth and his own conscience by mistating it. In this I share the misfortune bewailed by the Venerable Bede: "Dura est enim, conditio historiagraphorum; quia, si veridicant, homines provocant; si falsa scripturis commendant, Dominus, qui veradicos ab adulatoriis sequestrat, non acceptat."

Baltimore, May 15th, 1846.

J. P. Kennedy.

EDITORIAL.

Mr. Kennedy and his Reviewer.—Our readers will perceive that a considerable space in this number of the Magazine is occupied by the remarks of Mr. Kennedy, in answer to the reviewer of his discourse on the life and character of George Calvert. Although it is unusual to admit discussions of this nature into our pages, we have been led in the present instance, by the peculiar interest of the subject, to depart from our ordinary course, that the pro and con of the question being fully placed before the public, the facts of our colonial history, so honorable to Catholicity in general, and to our Catholic forefathers in particular, might stand forth in prominent triumph over the hostile attempts of a recent and miguided criticism. Both parties having now been heard at length, we can not consent to prolong the discussion in the Magazine. But, as the reviewer of Mr. Kennedy's discourse may feel himself entitled to a rejoinder through the same medium, and the latter gentleman has addressed his remarks to us, we consider ourselves bound to express some opinion on the merits of the question. In doing this, we will satisfy the reviewer that we have duly appreciated his performance, and, at the same time, we will render a good service to Mr. Kennedy in saving his reply from a more searching criticism.

Before entering upon the vindication of his discourse, he complains at length of the acrimony and acerbity of temper displayed in the review. They who will take the trouble to compare the two articles will perhaps coincide with us in the opinion that the reviewer has the advantage in point of good temper. The charge that his strictures are sectarian and polemical, is not sustained by the facts. If he is laudatory of Catholics, he has in no place, so far as we recollect, spoken so strongly in commendation of them as do the Protestant writers themselves whom he quotes; and in examining the case of conscience involved in taking the oath of supremacy, he has considered the question, not according to his and Calvert's particular religious sentiments, but merely with reference to the general obligations of conscience and honor recognised by the Christian and the gentleman. To us it appears that the review evinces great forbearance on this point, and even magnanimity, in not pressing Mr. Kennedy upon the lax morality which his theory implies, and the writer very plainly had too much respect for the orator's moral integrity to test it by any personal application of the principles which he has set forth. So far as Mr. Kennedy himself is concerned, we think that the spirit of the review was "more in sorrow than in anger," although, indeed, the array of authorities against the objectionable passages of the discourse somewhat resembled the grim display of cannon operating from some strong fort against a fragile bark.

Mr. Kennedy has again attempted to enlist

LIBRARY OF ST. JOHN'S
BOSTON [illegible] SEMINARY,
BRIGHTON, MASS.

public sympathy in his favor, by showing the right which he possesses to express his particular views of history. But this right was not questioned by the reviewer; it was the labored attempt to falsify history that was complained of; to substitute fanciful conjectures for recorded and well attested facts. And surely, when this is the case, any citizen has an equal right to protest against the offence which has been committed. The orator's defence of the Maryland Historical Society is altogether gratuitous; for the reviewer spoke of that institution in terms of the highest respect and commendation, and quoted largely from the discourse of its first orator in opposition to Mr. Kennedy's assertions, showing that the latter gentleman was contravening the intentions of the society by substituting his fanciful speculations for genuine history.

Mr. Kennedy enters upon his reply by furnishing a summary of his biography of Calvert, and then proceeds to defend it with a view to show the eulogistic character of his discourse. But this summary reminds us very much of the translation made by a tyro, who skipped all the *hard words:* for he omits all the dark shades which he threw into his first portrait of Lord Baltimore, and which undoubtedly represented him as selfish, temporizing, and despotic. In other parts of the reply he altogether evades the point in question, and adroitly starts another, and in this way he pretends to answer the objections made by the reviewer, when he actually keeps these objections entirely out of view. We shall furnish instances of this unfairness in the sequel, and show, particularly on one occasion, a remarkable contradiction between the assertions of the discourse and the historical evidence adduced in the reply.

As to the testimony by which Mr. Kennedy has undertaken to confirm his original statements regarding Calvert's religious opinions, it presents nothing new. It was nearly all furnished in the discourse, and all refuted in the review. Such is the argument drawn from the character of King James I, which is again urged by the orator, with the only additional remark, that the duke of Buckingham's mother became a Catholic, and that if any thing could induce the king to withdraw his favor from the son, it would be this circumstance. But, although it does not appear from history, nor from Mr. K's observations, that the king did withdraw his favor from the duke, this event is produced by Mr. K. as another proof of James' insurmountable aversion for converts!! We have also the same scrap of a letter from Abbott to Roe, without any date whatever, and which Mr. K. admits was written by an enemy. This letter, if it proves any thing, shows that Calvert was not always a Catholic. We have the same reference to the terms "popishly affected," and "Hispaniolized papist,"—used by enemies,—though it was shown in the review that these names were employed by the party opposed to the "Spanish match," in order to render odious such as, in conjunction with the king himself, Lord Digby and others, favored this measure which had agitated English politicians for some years, and caused the formation of two parties as hostile to each other as whigs and tories.

Mr. K. accuses the reviewer of attaching undue importance to the question, whether Calvert was originally a Catholic or only a convert to that faith. But Mr. K. started that question himself, and, although it would be of no consequence in itself which were true, the inferences which Mr. K. draws from his hypothesis implicate Calvert's character in essential points; hence in his letter he declares: "The fact we have been discussing, every one will perceive, is one of prominent consideration in the true historical estimate of Calvert's character," and for this reason he devotes the greater portion of his present reply to this topic. He has also disclosed to us the secret of his motive in attacking the history of Calvert and Maryland, when he informs us that the several patriotic orations delivered of late years to commemorate the landing of the first settlers of Maryland, and which ought to have enlisted the approbation of every Marylander, were offensive to his *un*sectarian taste, because they made Calvert a "religious hero." He could not write upon "this key note," and therefore it was, we presume, that he determined to take down the pride of Catholics as the founders of religious liberty. The reviewer abstained from assigning any motives for the tone of Mr. Kennedy's discourse, but he has himself frankly furnished them in the above mentioned declaration. Had he been, however, a true eulogist of Calvert, he would have discovered in the religious designs of the English lord a subject of special commendation, inasmuch as the main object of Calvert to found a colony for his Catholic brethren did not prevent him from extending the hand of fellowship to all men, and granting to all Christians equal civil and religious rights. This is the peculiar glory of Calvert, and the very feature in his whole history which all other writers have considered as the basis of his preëminent claims to the veneration and gratitude of modern freemen.

Having alluded to Mr. Kennedy's unfairness, we will now show that he has displayed a wonderful agility in "escaping an argument." He stated in his discourse that, in 1632, the date of the charter of Maryland, our colonial history furnished abundant examples of government on a much more popular basis than that of Calvert, and he infers that Lord Baltimore was no great admirer of those forms which diffused power amongst the people. The reviewer, however, proved that there was not one government that conferred as extensive privileges upon the people as that of Maryland, and he challenged Mr. K. to produce a single instance of such government among the abundant examples to which he referred. Mr. K. has not attempted it. The review quoted from Mr. K's preface to *Rob of the Bowl* his own declaration in favor of the superiority of the Maryland government, in which

he says he believes it "the most wisely planned and honestly executed scheme of society which, *at that era*, at least, was to be found *in the annals of mankind*." Now, instead of acknowledging the error contained in the discourse, he says: "I still repeat, however, that such powers do not accord with the more generally received notions of the *present time*, as to what constitutes free and safe government," and he affects to consider the reviewer as advocating prerogative against privilege, and to hold very different sentiments himself. If this be not an attempt to escape an argument, we do not understand the phrase. The question is not between the merits of our colonial government and those of the *present time*, but between the comparative excellence of Calvert's government and the other legislative systems of *his own day*. But Mr. Kennedy, in order to save himself, has set aside the real question and enters upon another which is perfectly foreign to the subject. What would he think of a judge upon the bench who would proceed to pass sentence upon a prisoner for highway robbery, when the only offence brought against him at the trial, was assault and battery?

In the review, Mr. K. was charged with quoting a part only of a sentence in the charter, to sustain his assertions about Lord Baltimore's attachment to prerogative in preference to popular privilege, and the reviewer gave the *whole sentence* from the charter, which actually required the proprietary to assemble the people or their representatives for the framing of laws, and limited the exercise of legislative powers to the proprietary and people jointly. It will be seen that Mr. K. is far from explaining satisfactorily his partial and garbled extract.

The reviewer accused Mr. Kennedy of an attack on Fuller's veracity, founded upon the supposed date of the charter for Avalon. Mr. Kennedy denies that he made such an attack, and he argues the question with so much animation as to show that he considers it "his great point." As he states that there is a direct issue of fact between the reviewer and himself, our respect for both requires that we examine the point in the "sharp light" which Mr. K. professes to throw upon it. He declares that "there is *no trace of such an attack* to be found in the discourse." And again; "In this extract, the reader will remark there is not a syllable about the supposed date of the Avalon charter." We shall see.

In the Discourse, p. 18, he quotes this passage from Fuller: "During his being secretary, he had a patent to him and his heirs, to be absolutus dominus et proprietarius, with the royalties of a count palatine of the *province of Avalon*, in Newfoundland. Here he built a fair house," &c. And in his next paragraph Mr. K. says: "the settlement in Newfoundland *alluded to in this extract*, was made in 1621, in which year, according to the account of Oldmixon in his British Empire in America, Sir George Calvert sent Capt. Wynne thither with a small colony," &c., and, he adds, "The charter or grant, however, for *this plantation*, it is said, upon some *doubtful and rather obscure testimony*, bears date of the 21st year of the king, which would assign it to the year 1623," p. 19. Mr. K. has then endeavored to show that the latter date was inaccurate, and that the settlement made by Capt. Wynne, in 1621, was the settlement of Avalon. On p. 30, also, he asserts that "Calvert settled his colony in 1621, and that Oldmixon and others ascribe this settlement to his wish to provide an asylum for persecuted Catholics, &c. The assertion of it by Oldmixon and those who have preceded or followed him, demonstrates that they did not credit the story of the conversion as given by Fuller: for the author of the Worthies of England dates the conversion *three years later* than the settlement *of Avalon*."

"Doubtless," says Mr. Kennedy, in his present letter, "the reader of the Review, &c., believes that I have some where in the Discourse confounded *the settlement in* 1621 with the *date of the charter*," and with some sarcastic remarks he quotes himself as follows: "The settlement of Newfoundland alluded to in this extract (an extract from Fuller which had first been given) was made in 1621," &c. But why not give us the extract? It contains the very point in question; it proves for the Reviewer and against Mr. K., that the latter did confound "the settlement in 1621 with the date of the charter." The only settlement alluded to in the extract is the settlement *of Avalon*, and Mr. K. attempts to prove that the evidence of its date, being so late as 1623, is "*doubtful and obscure testimony*," and the reviewer has already shown, from Bozman, that the evidence of this being the true date is stronger than any produced on the subject. Yet, asks Mr. K. "Have I fallen into the 'fallacy' of stating that Avalon was *chartered* and settled in 1621?" We think he has. For he has pronounced the date of the charter in 1623 as doubtful: and *Avalon* had no existence until the charter created it: and he has said that the settlement alluded to by Fuller was made in 1621, and the passage from that writer which Mr. K. has suppressed, in his quotation referred to above, designates "*the province of Avalon*." The settlement of Captain Wynne was in a part of Vaughan's tract called Cambriol or Little Wales, on the southernmost part of the Island of Newfoundland, which had been patented several years before, but the settlement of Avalon was made by Calvert upon a grant of the king in 1623, and Avalon had no legal existence or name until the king's patent gave it both. Calvert actually owned the tract settled by Capt. Wynne—by purchase from Vaughan: a grant from the king to him, therefore, was unnecessary for that portion of Newfoundland.—But Avalon was a new and distinct grant in 1623, and therefore, when Mr. K. inquires, "have I fallen into the fallacy of stating that Avalon was chartered and settled in 1621?" we furnish the answer from his Discourse, p. 30: "Calvert settled his colony in Newfoundland

in 1621," &c., and again, "the author of the Worthies of England dates the conversion three years later than the settlement of AVALON," &c. Fuller's date of the conversion is 1624, and Avalon did not exist until 1623. If the curious reader will examine the review and the Discourse, he will be at no loss to decide who has attempted a "feat of mystification."

In the formal argument which follows Mr. K's array of authorities to sustain his Discourse, he is more cruel to himself than the reviewer was: for the historians whom he quotes are unanimous in declaring that Calvert's design in settling in Newfoundland was to found an asylum for Catholics, and in his Discourse, p. 24, he asserted that "There is *no evidence* that his ardor in these undertakings was stimulated by *any motive* having reference to particular religious opinions!" And again, p. 30, in speaking of the settlement of Newfoundland, he declared, "Oldmixon and others, amongst whom I find our own historian Bozman, have ascribed this settlement to his wish to provide an asylum for persecuted Catholics, although *I can not discover any warrant for this statement*, either in the history of the times or in what is known of Calvert,"—we presume he has made the discovery since the review was written—but he continues—"Yet the assertion of it by Oldmixon and those who have preceded" (what historians were they?) "or followed him, *demonstrates* that they did not credit the *story of the conversion as given by Fuller!*" That is, they were not entitled to credit for their account of the nature and objects of the settlements, the history of which they actually wrote, but they were excellent authorities for Mr. K's purpose, because they never alluded to Calvert's conversion, this question not entering within the scope of their works:—and they are strong evidence against Fuller, whose biography they never mention, and which probably they had never seen. This may be good logic—but we would have reversed the reasoning, and said they were of no authority as to Calvert's conversion; because, with the exception of Bozman, they do not touch upon the subject. They profess to give a history of the settlements of Newfoundland, not of the life of Sir George Calvert. As this Avalon question, though a minor one with the reviewer, is a capital point with Mr. K., and has given him no small trouble, courtesy perhaps requires us to examine his witnesses, and we rejoice for Mr. K's sake that this task has fallen to our lot rather than the reviewer's.

Mr. K. quotes, 1st, Oldmixon, 2d, Douglass, 3d, Modern Univ. History, 4th, Wynne's Brit. Emp. in America, 5th, Bozman, to prove that Calvert was a Catholic when he made the first settlement in 1621. Now the most delightful circumstance in our task is that the examination of all these authorities is narrowed down to that of one—for the last four copy Oldmixon, in some places using the same words, without pretending to original information, and they consequently add nothing to the testimony of that writer. We shall, therefore, examine only the leader of Mr. K's host.

Oldmixon, like Mr. Kennedy, has confounded Calvert's settlement in Cambriol with his settlement of Avalon. He does not refer to the assignment of Vaughan's interest at all, and was manifestly ignorant of it. It is apparent that he had not seen Vaughan's book; for what he mentions of Vaughan's history is quoted from Anthony Wood. He states that Calvert got the grant of Avalon, but without giving the date of the grant, and that he sent Capt. Wynne to settle it in 1621. It is now proved and admitted by Mr. Kennedy that the grant of Avalon was not made until 1623, consequently what Oldmixon states of Calvert's personal history refers to the events connected with the settlement of his province, and after he had withdrawn from the cabinet in 1624. His work was published seventy-six years after Calvert's death, when the latter had become conspicuous in history from the fact of his having founded the Catholic colony of Maryland. Finding him thus prominent as a Catholic, and also that when he first visited Newfoundland himself it was to found an asylum for his brethren who were denied freedom of worship, he confounded the settlement of Capt. Wynne with that of Avalon, and concluded that the original design was the establishment of a Catholic colony. Bozman quotes Oldmixon, and it appears that neither of them had seen Fuller, as they do not refer to him; and Bozman's authorities for the life of Calvert are Belknap and Allen, two American authors. Had Bozman read Fuller it would have settled in his mind the question of the conversion—a fact on which he speculates without any pretensions to certainty. The weakness of quoting as so many authorities the successive copyists of one writer is too apparent to require comment. Mr. K., in another place, quotes both Arthur Wilson and Rapin, while the latter acknowledges that he copied his statement from the former. The unfairness of such a proceeding on the part of Mr. K. is the more striking, as he denies to the reviewer the advantage of support to Fuller from the confirmatory statements of Kippis and other biographers of Calvert, though from the nature and character of their works they must be presumed to have investigated, as it was their duty to do, the prominent facts connected with the subjects of their biography.

Mr. K. complains of the reviewer for not having noticed his argument that all the children of Calvert of whom we know any thing were Catholics. But it may be asked, of how many of the eleven children of Calvert do we know any thing? Were they all Catholics? Nothing certain is known of their being so, and it is useless to speculate upon the supposition that they were. It is not unfrequently the case that the same reasons which lead to the conversion of a parent are satisfactory to convince his family also. The conjecture of Mr. K. that Calvert's wife was a Catholic might account for his children's being instructed in that faith, and her prayers and good exam-

ple may have led to her husband's conversion. Her profession of the Catholic religion may also have contributed to the designation of Calvert as one "popishly affected." But surely it is frivolous to use arguments founded upon conjectures as to the faith of Calvert's wife and children, to disprove the assertions of his biographers as to his own conversion. If we admit that his wife and children were always Catholics, it is no proof that he was not a Protestant until 1624.*

While Mr. K. has often evaded the true points in question between him and the reviewer, and declaimed upon minor questions, he has omitted all notice of what appeared to us to be a conclusive argument in the review, drawn from contemporaneous history; we allude to the intimacy and confidential relations existing between Calvert and Sir Robert Cecil, earl of Salisbury. The reviewer showed, what indeed every one conversant with the history of that period must know, that Cecil was the leader of the party opposed to the Catholics, and their ablest and most implacable enemy: being identified with all the great measures for their oppression during the reign of Elizabeth and that of James to the day of his death, and pronounced by a contemporary historian and fellow courtier as *par excellence* "the *only* supporter of the Protestant faction." Mr. K. had shown in his Discourse that Cecil was Calvert's patron, and that about 1606 Calvert had "experienced a substantial proof of the prime minister's friendship in the gift of an appointment to the office of under or *private secretary to the minister himself*, which he held for several years," and that "he was brought into the way of preferment and favor through the friendship of the prime minister." The argument of the reviewer was that from the character of Cecil and the excitement of the times—being immediately after the discovery of the gunpowder plot—it was not to be imagined that he would have had a Catholic or a doubtful Protestant in so confidential a post as that of his private secretary. As Calvert retained the confidence of Cecil to the last, and was employed in the king's service, the inference that he could not have been a Catholic up to that period seemed conclusive. And so perhaps Mr. K. thought; for, although he has collected his scraps of "contemporaneous history" from authors who wrote long *after* Calvert's death, he has silently passed over this proof without any attempt to answer it. Of all the reasoning in the review founded on the history of the times, to defend Fuller's statement of Calvert's conversion, we considered the reference to his relations with Cecil and the elucidation of the history of lands granted in Ireland as the strongest points. Mr. K. has very artfully evaded the reviewer's argument on this latter point, and in a manner that exhibits his ingenuity at the expense of his candor.

The reviewer proved from history that the primary object of King James in the plantation of Ireland was the extirpation of the Catholic religion from that country, and that provisions to carry out this design were inserted in the patents for the Irish grants. He quoted Mr. Kennedy's own extract, which declares that the king conferred the lands in Ireland upon Calvert as "one that would plant and build the same according to his late instructions for the better furtherance and strengthening of the said plantation," and he asked whether it was possible that Calvert could have been a Catholic when he accepted a grant upon condition of giving his active aid to the extirpation of the Catholic religion in his own domains. Mr. K. endeavors by a diversion to "escape the argument." He is "unable positively to say, although the reviewer asserts they were, whether the conditions of plantation in Longford were the same as those for the plantation of Ulster. I have reason," he says, "to *suppose* they were not." But why not furnish the reason? The question is susceptible of proof. "This, however," continues Mr. K., "is not material." *We* think that it is the material point. But Mr. K. evidently prefers changing the subject, and making a new question.

We have observed, in perusing Mr. K's effusions on the life of Calvert, that he evinces a great inaptitude for the decision of cases *in foro conscientiæ*. His last attempt is not more felicitous than his former ones. He maintains that Calvert as a Catholic had no need of scrupling to hold lands which, it has been shown, were granted expressly for the purpose of extirpating the Catholic faith in Ireland, and upon conditions stipulated in the grant, that the holder should "take the oath of supremacy, and conform in religion." "But," says Mr. K., "if Calvert had any religious scruple on the subject, it would have shown itself in refusing to be made an accessory, an aider and abettor of the vile scheme of plunder by which the original proprietors were dispossessed." Now the argument of the reviewer is, that Calvert was a Protestant when the grant was conferred upon him, and Mr. Kennedy has stated in his Discourse that, in 1621, the date of the grant, the lands "remained in the king's hands undisposed of;" it is plain, therefore, that the confiscation was not made for Calvert. The lands had become vested in the crown, and could not revert to the original proprietors, but were at the disposal of the king. Calvert had received them from the king upon the conditions specified in the grant, which conditions he could, as a Protestant, faithfully comply with; but when he became a Catholic we presume that he considered this no longer possible, however easy to "a man of delicate religious scruples" Mr. Kennedy may suppose it to be. He, therefore, surrendered the lands to the king, with whom they remained to be disposed of as he pleased. How then could Calvert be considered "an aider and abettor of the vile scheme of plunder by which the original proprietors were dispossessed?" Mr. K. affects to consider Calvert's conduct in accepting the same lands again as an absolute gift in fee sim-

*From the epitaph of Calvert's wife, given by Mr. Kennedy in his Discourse, it appears that she died in 1622, two years before his conversion.

ple, inconsistent with the objections which we have mentioned to his holding the first grant. As we have already stated, Mr. K's discrimination as a casuist is not *very* remarkable. We can imagine that a man who would refuse to take land upon the conditions of swearing against his faith, and lending his aid for its extirpation on his own estate, might accept an *unconditional* title in fee simple of the same lands. Where is the inconsistency in this? But "there is no disputing about tastes," and we will leave Mr. K. in the enjoyment of what Roger Williams used to call the "sanctity of conscience."

Mr. K. accounts for the surrender and the new grant in a way of his own, which he thinks "obviously" correct. He asserts that Calvert's "estates in Ireland were *enlarged* under the new grants of the manor of Baltimore and that of Ulford." This fact may be obvious to Mr. K., but we never heard of it before. And referring to the authority furnished by Mr. K. in his Discourse (note, p. 18), we find that the regrant was of the *same* lands held before, with only a change of the tenure, and with the erection of *the premises* into the manor of Baltimore and the manor of Ulford, with the usual privileges, but without mention of any enlargement whatever.

We have another opinion of Mr. K's on a case of conscience, which, having been expressed in the Discourse without receiving any notice from the reviewer, is now repeated more emphatically. It relates to Calvert's appointment as a member of the privy council. Mr. K. says: "If Calvert's conscience would not allow him to hold the post of secretary of state, how did it serve him as a member of the privy council? The two offices, in the *nature of their duties, are identical.* A secretary of state and a member of the king's council were *equally* confidential advisers and *actors* with the king in his most delicate state affairs." Here we are again compelled to differ with Mr. Kennedy. The secretary of state was an executive officer, bound to be always on duty, and to perform many of the most important acts in the administration of government—to conduct diplomacy and correspondence generally; while a privy counsellor was merely an adviser, when the king chose to ask his opinion, not bound in virtue of his office to any executive duty whatever. We believe that the appointment is sometimes merely honorary. If these opinions are correct, and they seem to be sustained by Blackstone, we readily understand that a Catholic secretary of state in the reign of King James, the head of the Protestant church of England, would often have found himself in a false position, and, as Fuller says, would have been "wanting to his trust," or would have "violated his conscience in discharging his office." But as privy counsellor he might have been invited to the council only when matters disconnected with religion were under consideration, and thus rendered important service to his sovereign by reason of his experience in business, without compromising his faith.

We have devoted more space to the subject than we intended, and when we regard the amount of discussion which Mr. Kennedy's novelties have occasioned, we are surprised, and we regret that he should have labored so much and to so little purpose. The only thing he has proved is that

"Even though vanquished he can argue still."

The fact of Calvert's conversion, we think, can be established without much research, and as Mr. K. has done injustice to the author of the Worthies of England, we will endeavor to vindicate his history of Calvert by some illustrations of the character of Fuller and his performance, and we will close the subject finally by a biography from another writer.

Rev. Dr. Thomas Fuller, author of the Worthies of England, was born in 1608, and was educated at Cambridge. At the age of twenty-three he obtained a fellowship in Sidney college, and a prebend in the church of Salisbury. He officiated as rector of a country parish for some time, during which he applied himself to the completion of several works he had begun at Cambridge. About 1641 he removed to London, where he became distinguished as a preacher, and was chosen lecturer to the Savoy; he was a member of the convocation that sat at Westminster in 1640. Having excited the displeasure of the popular party by a sermon preached in Westminster abbey, on the anniversary of the king's inauguration, 1642, he left London and joined King Charles at Oxford in April, 1643. His biographer says that the king received him gladly, and, "having heard of his extraordinary abilities in the pulpit, was desirous of knowing them personally, and, accordingly, Fuller preached before him in St. Mary's church." In the same year he joined the royal army as chaplain to Sir Ralph Hopton. "And now," say his memoirs, "attending the army from place to place, he constantly exercised his duty as chaplain, yet found proper intervals for his beloved studies, which he employed chiefly in making historical collections, and especially in gathering materials for his 'Worthies of England.'" "While he was in progress with the king's army, his business and study there was a kind of errantry, having proposed to himself a more exact collection of the worthies general of England, in which others had waded before, but he resolved to go through." His biographer, in an account of his diligent mode of research, mentions that he made the acquaintance of the "learnedest and gravest persons," and that "it is incredible what a numerous correspondence the Dr. maintained and enjoyed by this means." After the surrender of the king's army in 1646, he returned to London, and "was chosen lecturer at St. Clement's lane, near Lombard street, and shortly after removed his lecture to St. Bride's in Fleet street." In 1648, he was presented to the perpetual curacy of Waltham abbey in Essex, and "spent that and the following year between London and Waltham." He married a sister of the Viscount Baltinglasse about 1654,

and a short time before the restoration he was readmitted to his lecture in the Savoy, and restored to his prebend of Salisbury. "He was chosen chaplain extraordinary to the king, created doctor of divinity at Cambridge by a mandamus, dated August 2d, 1660, and, had he lived a twelve month longer, would probably have been raised to a bishopric." But he died on the 16th of August, 1661. "His funeral was attended by at least two hundred of his brethren, and a sermon was preached by Dr. Hardy, dean of Rochester, in which a great and noble character was given of him."

Such was the character of Fuller as we have abridged it from his memoirs in the London edition of his works in 1840, by P. Austin Nuttall, D.D.

The Worthies of England was not published until 1662, after the death of the author, and it was dedicated to King Charles II. His biographer describes Fuller's powers of memory as very remarkable, and he says: "It was sufficiently known how steady he was in the Protestant religion against the innovations of the Presbyterians and Independents; but his zeal against these was allayed with greater compassion than it was towards the papists, and this raised him up many adversaries who charged him with Puritanism." Fuller himself, speaking of the sources of his information, says: "These may be referred to three heads, first, *printed books*; secondly, *records in public offices;* thirdly, *manuscripts* in the possession of private gentlemen. To which we may add a fourth, viz., *instructions* received from the *nearest relations* to those persons whose lives we have presented." His information from the last, he says, was obtained "by making my addresses by letters and otherwise to the nearest relations of those whose lives I have written." And, after lamenting the ignorance of some about their ancestors' history, he says: "However, this I must gratefully confess, I have met with many who could not, *never* with any who would not, furnish me with information herein."

We have been particular in those points connected with Fuller's life and character, which would enable us to judge of his credibility as the biographer of Calvert, both by his disposition to do justice and his opportunities for accurate information. We find then that he was a man of excellent character for virtue and integrity, filling an honorable place in the church of England, and moving in elevated society; that he was engaged for 16 years in the preparation of his work, during which time he was employed in his ministry in various parts of England, that he was with the king's army in a position that brought him into communication with many of the courtiers and noblemen, some of whom must have known Sir George Calvert during his official employment at court; and we find Fuller represented to have been exceedingly industrious in collecting information, travelling about from place to place for that purpose; with an uncommonly quick and retentive memory, and taking great pains to ascertain dates with precision. We find, moreover, that he resided in London in 1641–2, at which period Cecilius Calvert, the son and heir of Sir George Calvert, resided in that city. In 1643 this nobleman was with the king at Oxford, where Fuller then was. Cecilius, our first proprietary, survived his father forty-three years, and had a house in Wild street,* London—he died in 1675. Now Fuller was engaged in preparing his Worthies as early as 1643, only 11 years after the death of Sir George Calvert. He could not have had any difficulty in collecting information of Calvert from persons who had known him personally. But, as he himself informs us it was his custom to inquire of the nearest relations of the subjects of his biography, the presumption is that he derived from Cecilius those facts in the life of his father, which form the prominent incidents in his biography.† It is not to be supposed that a writer who was so assiduous a collector would have omitted such undoubted authority as Cecilius was. And he declares that, although he had found many who were unable, he had never found one who refused to furnish him with information of the lives of their parents or relations. Cecilius was about 26 years of age when his father died, and, being his heir, of course was in possession of his papers: so that there is no doubt of his ability to communicate the most accurate information necessary for a biography of his father.

Fuller's sketch of Calvert bears internal evidence that he must have derived the incidents he mentions, from a source not only authentic, but well informed as to particulars. He mentions the presentation of a jewel of great value to Buckingham, and the return of it by that nobleman, with the reasons for both. He mentions the cause of Calvert's giving the name of Avalon to his province; his going thither twice after King James' death, the name of the commander of the French fleet who attacked the fishermen, and the number of French prisoners that Calvert captured. He gives not only the date of Calvert's death, but the church in London, and the precise part of the church in which he lies buried; "the chancel of St. Dunstan's in the west." And the concluding words of the biography would indicate that Cecilius was known to him, and that he esteemed him; for he says Sir George died, leaving his son, the right honorable Cecil Calvert, now Lord Baltimore, heir to his honor, estate and noble disposition." Now in a biography so particular as this is, when the same author states the most striking event of Calvert's life, giving the date and circumstances with apparent confidence, we think there can be no doubt of his correctness. His words are these:

* Ant. Wood and Dodd, in the article John Lewger.

† It may be mentioned as an additional source of information for Fuller, that Anne, the eldest daughter of Sir George Calvert, who was married to William Peasley, Esq., resided in London in 1642, as appears by original letters from her and her husband, and from Lord Cecilius, dated London, 1642. These letters were exhibited to the Maryland Historical Society in January last.

"His abilities commended him first to be secretary to Robert Cecil, earl of Salisbury, lord treasurer of England. Afterwards he was made clerk of the council, and at last principal secretary of state to King James, succeeding Sir Thomas Lake in that office, anno 1619. Conceiving the Duke of Buckingham justly instrumental in his preferment, he presented him a jewel of great value; which the duke returned again, not owning any activity in his advancement, whom King James, ex mero motu, reflecting on his ability, designed for the place. This place he discharged above five years; until he willingly resigned the same, 1624, on this occasion. He freely confessed himself to the king that he was then become a Roman Catholic, so that he must either be wanting to his trust, or violate his conscience in discharging his office. This his ingenuity so highly affected King James, that he continued him privy counsellor all his reign (as appeareth in the council book) and soon after created him Lord Baltimore, of Baltimore in Ireland."

We will subjoin a biographical sketch of Calvert from Dodd, of whose rare work Mr. Chalmers thus speaks in his Biographical Dictionary, vol. xii, p. 147.

"Having had repeated occasion to consult it, we are ready to acknowledge our obligations for information derived from this history, which cost the author the labor of thirty years."

"GEORGE CALVERT:* born at *Kyplin* in the Chapelry of Bolton in Yorkshire, son of Leonard Calvert, and Alice, daughter of John Crossland, of Crossland. He was educated in Trinity College in Oxford, where he was admitted a gentleman commoner, anno 1593, aged 15: afterwards he travelled and improved himself so much abroad, as to be made under secretary to Sir Robert Cecil, chief secretary of state; still continuing a favorite, as his patron rose in the eye of his prince. King James I knighted him Sept. 29, 1617: and about the same time he was made clerk of the council. Anno 1624, Feb. 16, he was created Lord Baltimore of Longford in Ireland, by the name of Sir George Calvert, of Danbywisk in Yorkshire, knight, and *about that time became a member of the Catholic church.* He had applied himself to maritime affairs, and made some discoveries in America: in recompense whereof he was made sole proprietor of a part of the continent to which he gave the name of Maryland. He was an able statesman; an enemy however to flattery, selfishness, and other vices too common among persons in that station of life. Being made chief secretary of state, he gave great content, and was punctual in the office, which he held some time jointly with Sir Robert Naunton, who commonly followed his advice to his great improvement.

Lord Baltimore died April 15th, 1632, and lies buried in St. Dunstan's chancel in Fleet street. His works are, 1. Carmen funebre in D. Untonum 4to. 1596; 2. Speeches in parliament; 3. Letters on state affairs; 4. An Account of Maryland; 5. The Answer from Thos. Tell Troth on the practice of princes, and lamentations of the Kirk. London, 4to. 1642.*

* Camb. sub ann. 1619-20. MS. Ant. Wood Athen. Oxon.

FOREIGN INTELLIGENCE.

ENGLAND.—*Conversions.*—The Rev. Geo. Dudley Ryder, Vicar of Easton, near Winchester, second son of the late Dr. Ryder, Protestant bishop of Lichfield and Coventry, has been received into the Catholic church, together with his lady and the members of his family, at Rome. Mr. Ryder was married to a near relative of the late Mr. Wilberforce, and is also, we believe, connected by marriage with Bishop Wilberforce, and Archdeacon Manning. His conversion, therefore, may be regarded as an important one, and that it attests the power of our holy Faith in quarters of the establishment hitherto among the least susceptible of its influence. What may not be hoped when the son and near connexions of Protestant leaders, such as the late respected Bishop Ryder, and the celebrated champion of the Anti-Slavery cause, become witnesses to the power of an exclusive faith and a dominant church?

To the editor of the Tablet.—Sir—It is with much pleasure that I have to inform you of the reception into the church of Christ of the following persons at St. Servan:—Mrs. Major Browne and her daughter; Mrs. Bonsall and her four children, and Mrs. Utting and her three children. Before very long I trust to be enabled to send you another list.—I am, sir, your obedient servant, A CONVERT.

IRELAND.—The beloved, the sanctified President of Allhallows is—how shall I pen the heart-rending word—no more. The brightest ornament of the Irish church, and in the early dawn of manhood, the light brilliant enough to be seen in far distant climes, has set to rise no more—or rather to rise only when clad with the transcendent glories in which the Master he loved and imitated will not fail to array him. The sainted Father Hand died here yesterday evening within a few minutes of eight o'clock, in the very act of exhorting the gifted and respected superiors of this interesting establishment to 'love one another'—'to be perfect;' 'diligite alterutrum,' did he, with the apostle of love, again and again affectingly repeat; and the grand incentive to sanctity, 'Ambula coram me, et esto perfectus,' was the earnest inculcation of his dying and once eloquent lips. The public voice, and in this instance I trust 'Vox populi vox Dei,' canonizes his virtues and proclaims him a saint.

Puseyism in Ireland.—The silent, but, perhaps, steady march of Puseyism among the Protestant parsons in Ireland is not sufficiently noticed. The controversy concerning the tendency of St. Columba's College, at Stock

* From *Dodd's Church History of England*, vol. 3, folio, p. 46. A new edition, in 14 vols., of this work is in the course of publication, by Rev. M. A. Tierney, F. R. S. and F. S. A., with valuable notes.

Allen, in the county of Meath, has created considerable interest, and it is clear that a considerable portion of its patrons, friends, and managers are impregnated with these "half-popery" doctrines, which have nearly unchurched the church by law established.

SINGAPORE.—Our holy religion, I am glad to say, is progressing here, especially among the Chinese, who seem inclined to embrace the truth where they know it. We had, last year, 78 baptisms of adults, almost all Chinese; and I hope that this year we will have a larger number. They are, when once converted, our consolation, by their good behaviour and their zeal in practising our religion with all the regulations of the church. I remember that your dear departed friend, Captain G., often told me that he had never been so much edified as he was the first time he saw them in the church, saying, or rather singing, the holy rosary; for they sing all their prayers.

The Malays, up to this time have not evinced any wish to listen to the truth, being all fanatic Mussulmans. I speak of the generality of the nation.

The Protestants *here* are not so inclined to become Catholics as they are in England, for many reasons; and the chief is, that they are too busy about making money. They are money-making people, and such people seldom have their ears open to God's grace.

There is a new church in course of erection by the Catholics of Singapore; 13,000 dollars have already been expended on it, and 2,000 more are necessary to complete it.

VIENNA.—*Conversions.*—Madame Hurter, wife of the celebrated convert, made her abjuration in the chapel of the nuncio at Vienna on the 10th March, and received confirmation and the holy eucharist. The learned historian is thus doubly consoled, his wife and son having both followed his example.—*C. Herald.*

AUSTRALIA.—The Catholic missionaries appear to be exceedingly zealous and active in this distant part of the earth. The papers, like those of the United States, hold out the strongest assurance of success in establishing the Redeemer's church, not only amongst the colonists but the Indian population. Several missionaries have lately sailed from Australia to extend the knowledge of the Gospel to the islands in the Pacific Ocean, and wherever establishments have heretofore existed the truth is taking deep root, and great numbers have been regenerated in Baptism.—*C. Tel.*

DOMESTIC.

ARCHDIOCESS OF BALTIMORE.—*Statement of the finances of the Catholic cathedral church of Baltimore for the year ending May* 1, 1846.

RECEIPTS FOR YEAR ENDING MAY 1, 1846.

Balance from last account,	$ 511 89
Pew rent,	3645 36
Sunday collections,	1192 28
Grave-yard,	1028 00
Legacy,	600 00
Sale of Pews,	300 00
Sinking fund,	$ 1278 33
Arrears,	230 96
Sundry sources,	38 04
	$8824 86

PAYMENTS FOR YEAR ENDING MAY 1, 1846.

Expenses and salaries,	$ 2945 60
* Debt extinguished,	2234 16
Interest,	2071 84
Loan to Calvert Hall,	841 29
Taxes and repairs, &c.,	391 71
	$8484 61
† Balance,	340 25
	$8824 86

* The debt of the Cathedral church is at present $37,017.

† Balance is subject to a demand for interest of $167,12.

Statement of the finances of Calvert Hall for the year ending May 1, 1846.

RECEIPTS FOR YEAR ENDING MAY 1, 1846.

Balance from last account,	$ 392 85
Rent of Hall,	790 67
From treasurer of cathedral,	841 29
Sundry sources,	23 25
Legacy,	250 00
	$2298 06

PAYMENTS FOR YEAR ENDING MAY 1, 1846.

Interest,	$ 695 27
‡ Debt extinguished,	1221 29
Taxes, fuel, light, &c.,	188 43
	$2104 99
Balance May 1, 1846,	193 07
	$2298 06

‡ Statement of stock and floating debt due as per account rendered and published May 1, 1845, was $12463 83
To which add debts since ascertained, 1323 67
$13789 50
Deduct debt extinguished from May 1, 1845, to May 1, 1846, 1221 29
Present ascertained outstanding debt, $12566 21

Confirmation.—The Most Rev. Archbishop administered the sacrament of confirmation, on June 7th at St. Thomas, Charles county, Maryland, to one hundred and twenty-five persons; at Cobneck, on the 9th, to fifty; at Newport, on the 11th, to eighty-four. On Sunday, the 14th, the Rt. Rev. Dr. Chanche confirmed eighty-four persons at St. Patrick's church, Baltimore, and, on the following Sunday, he conferred the same rite in the chapel of St. Mary's seminary, on eighteen of the college students and one adult. On the same day, the Most Rev. Archbishop confirmed one hundred and twenty-eight persons at the cathedral.

Young Catholics' Friend Society.—New members of the Young Catholics' Friend Society elected in April: Wm. H. Tiernan, Henry Doize, Matthew Bennet, M. McConn, Au-

gustus Trumbo. In May, Joseph A. Keenan, Andrew Monks, John Walsh. June, Thomas Clark, John Payne, Frederick Hook, Mark W. Jenkins, Jr.

Diocess of Philadelphia.—*Dedication of St. Peter's church, Reading.*—The new church of St. Peter, in the borough of Reading, was dedicated to Almighty God on Sunday, the 24th ultimo. The Rt. Rev. Bishop of Cincinnati preached on the occasion.—*Cath. Her.*

Ordination.—On Saturday, in Ember week, the Rt. Rev. Mathias Loras, bishop of Dubuque, at the request of the bishop of this diocess, ordained, in the cathedral, Jeremiah Ahern subdeacon, and Richard O'Connor and Michael Malone priests, all students of the theological seminary of St. Charles Borromeo. —*Ibid.*

Confirmation.—Confirmation was administered by the bishop of Dubuque, on Trinity Sunday, to sixty eight persons in the church of St. Peter, West Kensington.—*Ib.*

Confirmation.—The sacrament of confirmation was administered on Sunday, 14th June, by the bishop of this diocess to a large number in the church of St. Philip Neri, Southwark.—*Ib.*

Diocess of New York.—*Confirmation.*—In St. Patrick's cathedral, New York, the Rt. Bishop McCloskey administered the sacrament of confirmation in the cathedral on the 24th of May, to one hundred and seventy persons, several of whom are converts. The Very Rev. Dr. Spalding of Louisville, Ky., preached an eloquent sermon at the 10 o'clock mass.—*F. Jour.*

St. Mary's church.—The sacrament of confirmation was administered in St. Mary's church, on Sunday last, at 8 o'clock mass, by the Rt. Rev. Dr. Hughes, to about two hundred and fifty persons.—*Ib.*

Diocess of Boston.—*Confirmation.*—The Rt. Rev. Bishop Fitzpatrick administered the sacrament of confirmation to two hundred and twenty-three persons, on Sunday, 31st of May, in the Cathedral, and on the 7th of June, he confirmed one hundred and twenty persons at St. Mary's.—*Boston Pilot.*

Diocess of Pittsburg.—*New churches.*—We learn from the *Pittsburg Catholic* that, on Tuesday, the 10th of June, the corner stone of a new church was laid at Greensburg. The Rt. Rev. Dr. O'Connor preached an English sermon on the occasion, and Rev. Mr. Muller preached in German. The corner stone of a church was also laid on the 6th of May, in Indiana, by the Very Rev. J. A. Stillinger.

Diocess of Vincennes.—*Correction.*—A correspondent of the *Catholic Advocate* says: "Through the mistake of your correspondent the notice which appeared in the Advocate of the ordinations, lately held in Vincennes, was given erroneously—the following is correct:

At an ordination held in the cathedral of Vincennes by the Rt. Rev. Bishop of the diocess, on Ember Saturday, Rev. A. Carius was promoted to the priesthood, Rev. Ernest Audran and Edward Foller to deaconship, and Messrs. Philip O'Connell and Bartholomew Pearse to minor orders. On Sunday, April 26, Rev. Ernest Audran was ordained priest, and Rev. Andrew Bennet and John Ryan deacons. The latter ordination, occurring during the diocesan retreat, was one of the most impressively solemn ever celebrated in the diocess. Twenty-seven clergymen surrounded their bishop in the sanctuary, and invoked with him the descent of the Holy Spirit on this new sentinel called to the watch-towers of Israel. The solemn Gregorian chant, with which the pontifical high mass was celebrated, has seldom been surpassed in any church in America."

Diocess of Cincinnati.—*Confirmation.*—This sacrament was administered by the Rt. Rev. Bishop of the diocess to fifty-five persons in the church of the "holy angel," Sandusky city, on the feast of Pentecost. Amongst the number were several converts, whose entrance into the true fold created quite a sensation in the denominations they had left. The church was blessed on the occasion by the bishop, assisted by the Rev. Messrs. Machebeuf and Byrne. In the chapel of St. Philomena, on the Sandusky river, there were thirty-six persons confirmed on Monday, the 8th of June, and forty-five at Lower Sandusky, where a new church was dedicated.

The corner stone of the new Ursuline convent was laid last week near Fayetteville, Brown county. It was an occasion of great joy and gratitude not only to the ladies and pupils of the institution, but to all classes of the population in that thriving settlement.—*C. Tel.*

Diocess of Richmond.—*Norfolk.*—We are much indebted to a highly respected correspondent at Norfolk for the following interesting information. We shall be pleased to hear from him again.—"The Catholic congregation of Norfolk is not large; but many of its members are distinguished for their piety and zeal. The church built some three years since is much admired for its tasteful simplicity and chasteness. Situated on the borders of the Elizabeth river, and surrounded by its picturesque graveyard and tall evergreens, it attracts the passer-by, and invites to serious meditation. Its walls are adorned with several pictures, among them two of rare merit, copies of Guido's crucifixion and Murillo's assumption. The choir is excellent, and the organ decidedly the best in the city. It is truly gratifying to behold the recollection and decorum of the congregation during divine service. The spiritual retreat conducted, during the past year by Father McElroy, and so generally and edifyingly attended by the Catholics of Norfolk, has exerted a very happy influence upon them, and still produces salutary fruits. The number of converts received into the church during the few past years is large. Since Christmas, fifteen adults have been adopted by this blessed spouse of Jesus Christ. Half of this number were solemnly baptized at Pente-

cost, and among them a lady seventy-five years old, formerly a member of the Episcopal church. Others are preparing for this happiness, and we devoutly hope that, under the influence of the Spirit of God, to whom alone belongs the honor of these conversions, many more, who now are aliens from the true church, may hear the voice of the good pastor, and enter into the one fold, under the one Shepherd.

Diocess of Charleston.—*Episcopal visitation.*—On the 21st May the Right Rev. Dr. Reynolds confirmed two persons at Greenwood, Scotland Neck, after which he visited Greenville, Washington and Newbern, preaching several times, and at the last mentioned place confirming five persons. He then visited Wilmington, where he laid the corner-stone of a new church.—*C. Misc.*

Diocess of N. Orleans.—*New church.*—On the 10th of May, the corner stone of a new church, under the title of the Annunciation, was laid at New Orleans, by the V. Rev. Abbe Rousselon, assisted by other clergymen. Rev. Mr. Perche preached on the occasion.

Giustiniani in Reading, Pa.—This itinerant scavenger to "the American Protestant Society" has lately been disgusting the good people of Reading with a lecture on auricular confession. The editor of the "Berks and Schuylkill Journal" honored this libeller with his presence, and, though rather ashamed of his condescension, seems to have profited by what he heard of the discourse so far as to give us some very sensible remarks on its character. He denounces, with commendable sincerity, the imputations cast upon our priesthood, and the unworthy innuendos thrown out against the ladies of our church. He also rebukes the perverse citation of extracts from Bishop Kenrick's theology, and has hit upon the true view to be taken of all such unwarranted misrepresentations of topics introduced and discussed by theologians with the purest intentions. What would be thought of a steam doctor, or vender of nostrums, who, to give currency and favor to his own quack remedies, should gather up all remarks offensive to delicate ears contained in the works of learned physicians, and use them as evidences of the depravity of the profession, and as means of supplanting them in the confidence of the public? The common sense of the community would revolt at such bare-faced audacity: and yet such a course would be in no way more outrageous than that practised by this scavenger of the American Protestant Society. In the language of the editor of the Reading paper: "A work should be judged by its general character and *design*, not by a few isolated passages, read out of their connection, and perhaps the meaning destroyed by running comments. We will suppose an infidel lecturer undertaking to show the character of the Bible, and carefully selecting from the laws of Moses all the allusions and enactments intended for a particular purpose, culling from the writings of the prophets and the apostles all that is most unsuited to a public audience,—would it be a fair representation of the Scriptures. Yet this book is placed in the hands of 'children and servant girls'—a chief cause of complaint on the part of the lecturer, with reference to another work used in the Catholic church, and in which it required some pains to find any thing objectionable. Admirable fastidiousness on the part of a people who have Don Juan and the Wandering Jew on their centre tables!"

We are sorry, however, to find in an article, otherwise so commendable, some concluding remarks to which we must take exceptions. We hardly expected from one whose intelligence entitles him to our sincere respect, a reason for not admiring our religion so ill-founded and so hurtful to our Catholic sensibilities as that which he has thought fit to adduce. When the editor of the Berks and Schuylkill Journal says of our religion that "it is hostile to liberty, and demands a divided allegiance not favorable to true patriotism," he satisfies us that, though many errors of his early teaching have melted away before the light of truth, there still linger about him some prejudices which his good sense has yet to struggle with and to overcome. We did not suppose we would have to say to a gentleman who has been at some pains to inform himself about our religion, that we owe no allegiance to the pope—that, if the united forces of all Italy were to invade our shores, not a Catholic could be found, if true to the principles of his religion, to prove recreant to his country's bidding, or to feel exonerated from his duty to fly to arms for his country's defence. Spiritual obedience is, however, quite another matter, and we have yet to learn that Protestants more than Catholics submit their spiritual conduct to the control of presidents, governors, congresses, or legislatures. A preacher in Reading will exercise more influence over his followers in affairs of religion than all the civil authorities of the country put together; but no one, therefore, charges him or his flock with divided allegiance; and, if the preacher moved to Constantinople, and his old followers at home still chose to submit to his spiritual guidance, who will say that their allegiance is divided? Religion is an affair distinct and separate from social organization; both may harmonize with and assist each other, though directed by different influences. Of what importance is it to a Protestant when he believes his minister a true expounder of religion whether he be in Reading or in Rome? and if it be of no importance to a Protestant's religion, why should it be harped upon as impairing a Catholic's patriotism? Truth is the same every where, and adapts itself to all manners and laws not intrinsically evil. It is not French, Italian, English or Egyptian, neither is it American, and therefore when Catholics, spread throughout the length and breadth of the earth, living under all forms of government, every where sustaining the peculiar civil institutions which foster them,—turn to Rome as the centre and

guardian of religious truth, we can not see how they part, either openly or tacitly, with one iota of that allegiance which they owe their own country for its protection of their civil rights. A careful discrimination between spiritual and political obligations would soon satisfy the intelligent editor of the Berks and Schuylkill Journal that he has been wrong in his views on this subject, and unkind in charging Catholicity with being "not favorable to true patriotism."

Chaplains in the army.—The *New Orleans Weekly Bulletin* of June 13th contains some very just remarks in regard to the recent appointment of Catholic chaplains for the army. That the request for chaplains, however, emanated from Gen. Taylor is not correct, it having originated with some Catholic officers in the army. The Bulletin, in its remarks upon Mexican affairs, alludes to an "ecclesiastical mission made to Mexico in 1839 or 1840, by Dr. Rosati, then bishop of St. Louis." We are confident that Bishop Rosati never visited Mexico, either in a public or private capacity. He was entrusted by the Holy See with a mission to Hayti, and visited that country in the discharge of the duties confided to him. The writer has very probably mistaken this circumstance for the mission to Mexico.

Rev. Mr. Hewitt.—This recent convert from the Protestant Episcopal church to Catholic truth, has published a pamphlet at Charleston, S. C., which contains "thoughts concerning the theories of High Churchmen and Tractarians, with reasons for submitting to the authority of the Holy See." We hope soon to be favored with its perusal, and to see it widely circulated among his former friends and present adversaries.

The Methodist Protestant.—We perceive from this paper of the 20th June that it has fallen under the editorial care of the *Rev. E. Y. Reese.* They who prefer dispassionate argument and Christian courtesy to intemperate abuse and coarse vulgarity in the discussion of controversial topics, will not regret the change that has been made in the editorial department.

LITERARY NOTICES.

The Bible against Protestantism, and in strict accordance with the Catholic faith, &c. By the Rt. Rev. Dr. Sheil, with an Appendix, proving that the reformed churches are destitute of a lawful ministry. First American stereotype edition. Boston: Thomas Sweeney. 12mo. pp. 296.

The publication of this work is a valuable service to our controversial literature. It discusses the disputed points of religion on Scriptural grounds, and is thus calculated, if not fully to inform the inquirer upon the subject of Catholic truth, to remove at least from his mind that fruitful source of prejudice which lies in the impression that the doctrines and practices of Catholicity are at variance with the teachings of the inspired Word. But while it may usefully serve this particular purpose, the treatise which is appended is better adapted for the radical instruction of those whose minds have been imbued with Protestant ideas, by demonstrating the necessity of a lawful ministry, its existence in the Catholic church, and the absence of it from the reformed sects. The dedication of the volume to the "Christian Alliance" is, we think, far from being in good taste.

The Boys' and Girls' Weekly Catholic Magazine. 8vo. Philadelphia. W. J. Cunningham.

We are pleased to see this new periodical for the special benefit of the youthful portion of the community. We have received three numbers of it which promise well for its usefulness in the cause which it has undertaken to serve. Each number embraces eight octavo pages, at two cents, and contains a variety of entertaining and instructive matter. We hope that this penny magazine for children will receive an extensive patronage.

Tract for the times, addressed to both Catholics and Protestants. By Spectator.

The author of this pamphlet has exposed the injustice of those itinerant no-popery lecturers who are so assiduously engaged now-a-days in endeavoring to humbug the American people in reference to Catholicity. He alludes, in a forcible manner, to the degrading system pursued by these imposters, and to the unprincipled favor which the reverend opponents of the church frequently extend to them. In an address of this kind, however, we deem it of the utmost importance to defend the cause of truth by the *argumentum ad hominem*, as well as to direct attention to its own positive evidences. The most striking proof of injustice to the Catholic church, under the circumstances alluded to by the tract, may and ought to be drawn from the reflection that, as Protestants would consider it an outrage upon every principle of honor and justice to consult their declared enemies in reference to their views of religion, so the Catholic church has a right to demand that her principles and practice be learned from her own recognised exponents, and not from the declarations of her avowed adversaries.

Lives of the Saints. By Alban Butler. Baltimore: Metropolitan press.

We have received Nos. X, XI and XII of this excellent work, which is now completed, to the great satisfaction of its numerous list of subscribers.

An Abridgment of Murray's English Grammar and Exercises, with Questions; adapted to the use of schools and academies; also an Appendix containing rules and observations for writing with perspicuity and accuracy. By M. J. Kerney. Baltimore: J. Murphy, 18mo.

We take particular pleasure in recommending this abridgment to the public. The notes and observations taken from the original are copious and well selected. In point of arrangement, it is superior to any other abridgment of Murray's Grammar. It has exercises prefixed to each chapter and section throughout the work, also to the rules and notes of syntax. Thus, by combining the grammar and exercise, a very desirable improvement has been effected; the pupil, at every step of his progress, has a practical illustration of the principles inculcated. The questions at the bottom of each page, and at the end of each exercise, will give an increased value to the work, and will be found convenient to the teacher and useful to the pupil. By their arrangement and that of the exercises much of that dryness which scholars usually experience, while committing to memory the rules and notes of grammar, will be removed; the study will become pleasing and interesting.

Besides embracing in a narrow compass all that is important or essential in the original grammar and exercise, this abridgment contains in its appendix several additional matters which will be found highly interesting and useful to the learner: such as the Art of Reasoning, Oratory, Elliptical Phrases, Popular Latin Phrases, with a literal English translation.

Tears on the Diadem: or the Crown and the Cloister: a Tale of the White and Red Roses. By Mrs. Anna H. Dorsey. N. York: E. Dunigan. 18mo. pp. 223.

An interesting story, and to the lovers of fiction an acceptable publication. It forms a number of the *Home Library.*

Constitutional Reform, in a series of articles contributed to the Democratic Review, upon Constitutional Guarantees in political governments, &c. To which are added two Letters of the Hon. Michael Hoffman, of New York, on the reorganization of the Judiciary of New York; also the Correspondence of Thomas Jefferson on Constitutional Reform. Edited by Thomas Prentice Kettell. New York, 142 Fulton street.

We are indebted to the politeness of the editor for a copy of the above pamphlet. The articles contained in it seem more particularly designed to enlighten the convention now assembled for the revisal and reform of the Constitution of the state of New York. They therefore in some instances point out defects peculiar to that instrument, though there is at the same time a great deal of useful information contained in them for all who would understand thoroughly the imperfections that exist in the old state constitutions generally. We can not, however, in a passing notice of this pamphlet, attempt to point out its merits, or such of its principles as we consider unwise. We can say, in all truth, that, in reading it attentively, we have found much to approve, and but little to condemn. We thought we discovered, in some places, traits of a partisan character, which circumstance, had we the time and space, would make us distrustful of the propriety of discussing them in this journal. We do not think that times of high party excitement are the proper ones for amending state constitutions, because there is always danger that parties, according to their preponderance, will seek to engraft upon them their empheral doctrines, and to give them a partisan character, and will strive to imbody in the fundamental law what might properly be entrusted to the statutory.

There are some additions recommended by the writer, to the Constitution of the state of New York, which have already been adopted by some of the states, and should certainly become a part of the organic law of every member of our confederacy. Is there, for instance, any consummation to be more devoutly wished for, than that which the writer recommends, of *securing the people in all future time* against the improvident use of public money and public credit? or that a state should be accountable in a suit at law for contracts with and obligations to individuals? The protection of the property of married women recommended by the writer, and already secured to them by several states, is worthy of all imitation, and creditable to the wisdom of its authors and supporters. Such a provision is only a novelty among those people who have the English law as the basis of their legislation. The civil law, which our Anglo-Saxon fathers affected to contemn so religiously, has always recognised a separate ownership of the wife, of such property as was hers in her own right, either before or after marriage. In our own country the enlarged philosophy of such men as Kent and Story has thrown down the barriers which the English common law writers had built up between their own and the civil law, and has taught us to embrace what is wise and just wherever we find it. The article on "Political Patronage," so far as it sets out *its evils*, is full of sound and just reflections, and will receive a response of universal approbation; but whether the *remedy* proposed for these evils will be received with equal unanimity is rather problematical. In conclusion, we would advise all who wish to have a just conception of what are considered defects in our old constitutions, to peruse this pamphlet attentively, and we hazard nothing in saying that they will be much enlightened by its contents.

ST. JOHN'S SEMINARY
3 8151 001 25065 0